

AD-A236 616



2

STUDY  
PROJECT

The views expressed in this paper are those of the author and do not necessarily reflect the views of the Department of Defense or any of its agencies. This document may not be released for open publication until it has been cleared by the appropriate military service or government agency.

FORMER BATTALION COMMANDER SURVEY

BY

LIEUTENANT COLONEL HAROLD W. LORD, JR.  
LIEUTENANT COLONEL MICHAEL J. PETRUCCI  
LIEUTENANT COLONEL HENRY C. RUTH  
United States Army

WITH ASSISTANCE FROM

LIEUTENANT COLONEL HUBERT BRIDGES, JR.  
United States Army

DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT A: Approved for public release.  
Distribution is unlimited.

USAWC CLASS OF 1991



U.S. ARMY WAR COLLEGE, CA

91-00618



Unclassified

SECURITY CLASSIFICATION OF THIS PAGE

## REPORT DOCUMENTATION PAGE

Form Approved  
OMB No. 0704-0188

1a. REPORT SECURITY CLASSIFICATION Unclassified			1b. RESTRICTIVE MARKINGS		
2a. SECURITY CLASSIFICATION AUTHORITY			3. DISTRIBUTION/AVAILABILITY OF REPORT Approved for public release. Distribution is unlimited.		
2b. DECLASSIFICATION/DOWNGRADING SCHEDULE					
4. PERFORMING ORGANIZATION REPORT NUMBER(S)			5. MONITORING ORGANIZATION REPORT NUMBER(S)		
6a. NAME OF PERFORMING ORGANIZATION U.S. Army War College		6b. OFFICE SYMBOL (If applicable)	7a. NAME OF MONITORING ORGANIZATION		
6c. ADDRESS (City, State, and ZIP Code) Carlisle Barracks, PA 17013-5050			7b. ADDRESS (City, State, and ZIP Code)		
8a. NAME OF FUNDING/SPONSORING ORGANIZATION		8b. OFFICE SYMBOL (If applicable)	9. PROCUREMENT INSTRUMENT IDENTIFICATION NUMBER		
8c. ADDRESS (City, State, and ZIP Code)			10. SOURCE OF FUNDING NUMBERS		
			PROGRAM ELEMENT NO.	PROJECT NO.	TASK NO.
11. TITLE (Include Security Classification) Former Battalion Commander Survey					
12. PERSONAL AUTHOR(S) LTC Harold W. Lord, Jr., LTC Michael J. Petrucci & LTC Henry C. Ruth					
13a. TYPE OF REPORT Group Study		13b. TIME COVERED FROM _____ TO _____		14. DATE OF REPORT (Year, Month, Day) 91 Apr 8	
15. PAGE COUNT 21-263					
16. SUPPLEMENTARY NOTATION					
17. COSATI CODES			18. SUBJECT TERMS (Continue on reverse if necessary and identify by block number)		
FIELD	GROUP	SUB-GROUP			
19. ABSTRACT (Continue on reverse if necessary and identify by block number) There are over 250 former battalion commanders attending resident Senior Service Colleges this year each of whom has a unique assessment of the viability and health of the U.S. Army at battalion level. Although most, if not all, of these officers were debriefed by the members of their immediate chain of command there is no mechanism to collect these assessments, organize the results and provide them to appropriate senior Army leaders. The purpose of this project is to develop a survey instrument to perform these functions and to administer this survey to the officers in the resident senior service college classes of 1991. The survey was developed around the framework of the Army Imperatives and measured former battalion commander attitudes about the adequacy of resources provided to them, the quality of their soldiers and their leaders, their ability to provide tough, realistic training experiences for their units and the command climate of which they were a part. The analysis of the 1991 classes shows some areas of concern but is very positive overall as might be expected given the population surveyed. The value of this survey, however, will be in					
20. DISTRIBUTION/AVAILABILITY OF ABSTRACT <input type="checkbox"/> UNCLASSIFIED/UNLIMITED <input type="checkbox"/> SAME AS RPT. <input type="checkbox"/> DTIC USERS			21. ABSTRACT SECURITY CLASSIFICATION		
22a. NAME OF RESPONSIBLE INDIVIDUAL Eugene H. Grayson, Jr., COL, USA Retired			22b. TELEPHONE (Include Area Code) 717-245-3129		22c. OFFICE SYMBOL AWCAC

measuring trends from year to year. Appended to the paper is a copy of the survey, the survey data itself (MSDOS compatible diskette), the statistical analysis program used, the raw output of the analysis program and a compendium of handwritten optional comments.

**USAWC MILITARY STUDIES PROGRAM PAPER**

**The views expressed in this paper are those of the author and do not necessarily reflect the views of the Department of Defense or any of its agencies. This document may not be released for open publication until it has been cleared by the appropriate military service or government agency.**

**FORMER BATTALION COMMANDER SURVEY**

**A GROUP STUDY PROJECT**

**by**

**Lieutenant Colonel Harold W. Lord, Jr., OD  
Lieutenant Colonel Michael J. Petrucci, AD  
Lieutenant Colonel Henry C. Ruth, AV**

**with assistance from**

**Lieutenant Colonel Hubert Bridges, Jr., AR**

**DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT A: Approved for public release; distribution is unlimited.**

**U.S. Army War College  
Carlisle Barracks, Pennsylvania 17013**

**Colonel (Ret.) Eugene H. Grayson, Jr.  
Project Adviser**

## ABSTRACT

AUTHORS: Harold W. Lord, Jr., LTC, OD  
Michael J. Petrucci, LTC, AD  
Henry C. Ruth, LTC, AV

With Assistance From: Hubert Bridges, Jr., LTC, AR

TITLE: Former Battalion Commander Survey

FORMAT: Group Study Project

DATE: 8 April 1991 PAGES: 21 CLASSIFICATION: Unclassified

There are over 250 former battalion commanders attending resident Senior Service Colleges this year each of whom has a unique assessment of the viability and health of the U.S. Army at battalion level. Although most, if not all, of these officers were debriefed by the members of their immediate chain of command there is no mechanism to collect these assessments, organize the results and provide them to appropriate senior Army leaders. The purpose of this project is to develop a survey instrument to perform these functions and to administer this survey to the officers in the resident senior service college classes of 1991. The survey was developed around the framework of the Army Imperatives and measured former battalion commander attitudes about the adequacy of resources provided to them, the quality of their soldiers and their leaders, their ability to provide tough, realistic training experiences for their units and the command climate of which they were a part. The analysis of the 1991 classes shows some areas of concern but is very positive overall as might be expected given the population surveyed. The value of this survey, however, will be in measuring trends from year to year. Appended to the paper is a copy of the survey, the survey data itself (MSDOS compatible diskette), the statistical analysis program used, the raw output of the analysis program and a compendium of handwritten optional comments.

# TABLE OF CONTENTS

	PAGE
INTRODUCTION	1
INSTRUMENT DEVELOPMENT	1
DISCUSSION	5
CONCLUSION	20
RECOMMENDATIONS	20
APPENDIX A SPSS/PC PROGRAM	A-1
APPENDIX B SURVEY RESULTS	B-I-1
APPENDIX C SURVEY	C-1
APPENDIX D ANECDOTAL COMMENTS	D-1
APPENDIX E DATA DISKETTES (record copy only)	
1. SPSS/PC Program	
2. Survey results, except questions 76 -78, 80.	
3. Survey results questions 76 -78, 80.	
4. Spreadsheet to analyze q 76 -78, 80.	



<b>Accession For</b>	
NTIS GRA&I	<input checked="checked" type="checkbox"/>
DTIC TAB	<input type="checkbox"/>
Unannounced	<input type="checkbox"/>
Justification	
By	
Distribution/	
Availability Codes	
Dist	Avail and/or Special
A-1	

## INTRODUCTION

In late July of 1991, approximately three hundred and fifty (350) Lieutenant Colonels and Colonels entered the five different Senior Service Colleges and their non-resident programs. These officers represent the Army's future leadership; the Brigade, Division and CORPS commanders of the 1990's. Having spent the last twenty(20) years successfully implementing Army's policies and training today's force, they now face the prospect of building down that force while maintaining readiness. They have reached a pinnacle in their career, an experience that should have been the most rewarding to date. Yet was it?

What were their perceptions of command? Did it meet their expectations? What was the command climate? Did their senior commanders support them and provide those resources necessary for success? These questions, and others, were being left unanswered because of the Army's current approach toward former battalion commanders (FBC). There has been no institutional tool available to capture the answers to the questions used above as examples. Moreover, there has been no tool applicable to long term study for use as either a predictive or historical source. All of this is against a back drop of finite Army Imperatives, directed by the Chief of Staff, that form the focal point for how the Army is to run and the direction in which it is to go.

The purpose of this study is to develop, for the first time, an instrument that will capture the observations, experiences, and impressions of those commanders who we deem to be the

leadership of tomorrow. It's format will collect, analyze, and validate the climate of the Army, its's leadership, and it's soldiers. To do so there must be a set of directions or imperatives against which to measure; these are the Chief of Staffs' imperatives.

Not all of the imperatives are quantifiable, not all lend themselves to analysis. Three do, and these are the three that this study uses to validate the instrument and to capture the current tone of the force. They are:

- a. Maintain a quality force- men and women who are dedicated and motivated.
- b. Conduct tough realistic training- This is the cornerstone of readiness and the basis for deterrence and capable defense.
- c. Develop competent, confident leaders.

The remainder of this text will address the development of the instrument, the facts and findings of the survey, and close with conclusions on the force and recommendations for the future. These are the opinions of today's battalion level leadership on the state of the force and the predictions for tomorrow. To start this process attention must first be given to the design protocol used to develop the survey and it's interpretive program.

#### INSTRUMENT DEVELOPMENT

Designing the instrument focused on producing a product that could quantitatively measure discriminating opinion concerning the validity of selected Army Imperatives. Orienting on a population of former battalion commanders attending the



Senior Service Colleges, the final product is in the form of a repetitive tool that can be applied over time with a minimum of, or, no changes. Data gleaned from this survey could be used to develop a historical base for comparison or, used as a predictive tool for the creation of policy. The following goals and objectives guided the development of the survey:

1. An instrument model that would define the population in multiple subsets.
2. An instrument that provides group defined answers/values for selected questions.
3. An instrument free of bias or major statistical error.
4. A simple instrument that would reinforce the "ease" of completing the task.
5. An instrument that could be machine read and scored.
6. An instrument that can be expanded.

In order that such a product was realized, a fixed methodology was necessary. Group discussion first turned to identifying those Army Imperatives that are quantifiable. This review led to the reduction of six imperatives to a measurable three. Having established this focus, the following steps were taken:

1. A library of questions was constructed addressing each of the imperatives.
2. Individual group members constructed question banks for selected imperatives.

3. Like questions were eliminated.
4. Question groups were combined from all members for each imperative and an initial survey was written.
5. The initial document was reviewed for applicability and focus and submitted to a member of the Army War College staff for review.
6. Staff recommendations were written into the document to ensure the development of statistical norms and discriminating answers.
7. A second review was made to eliminate "nice to have" questions thereby reducing the scope of the document.
8. The revised document was reviewed and, where necessary, rewritten to match SCANTRON requirements.
9. Selected students were used as a test population for validation and comment.
10. Further reduction in scope occurred.
11. The final document was issued to all appropriate students at the US Army War College, the Air War College, the Industrial College of the Armed Forces, and the National War College.

Subsequent to the return of the surveys, it became necessary to develop an evaluative tool to interpret the data. This evaluation was accomplished using a program written by the authors using the SPSS/PC language. The program is enclosed at Appendix A.

As noted, the data provided was presented by type commander, year group, and individual question. By portraying the data longitudinally we were able to determine trends, bias, and

anomalies between, or within groups. These answers were then subjectively judged predicated on the cumulative experience of the group to either support or not support the imperatives in question. This analysis was not capricious but dependent on a high percentage statement as to agreement or disagreement for the stated question. Survey results, uninterpreted, are at Appendix B.

Synopsized summaries for each of the areas studied are provided as text to this document and form the basis for subsequent conclusions. It is important to remember that the primary focus of this project was not the data or the "snap shot in time" it provides. Rather, it was the production of an instrument, with supporting software, that could over time be utilized to track the impact of the Army's imperatives on the climate of soldiers.

With this introduction, attention will now be given to individual areas of interest, the "fields" comments, and finally to the conclusions we have drawn.

#### DISCUSSION

Effective training results from the professional application of resources, personnel, and environment to the total process. For these reasons the mandate to "conduct tough, realistic training" becomes the benchmark against which to measure the force. Twenty-six(26) of the survey's questions were specifically directed to address training, it's accomplishments, and the commanders perceptions as to whether the Chief's

Imperative was being accomplished. These questions addressed training based on the 25 series of manuals, guidance from senior headquarters, new soldier basic skills, and other selected areas. They did not stand alone but also incorporated the impact of resource shortfalls, lack of facilities and other similar distracters. Commanders as a group felt they had been conducting tough , realistic training. This was independent of the type unit they commanded or command to which they were assigned. Combat support and combat service support commanders did report some constraints to training as a result of requirements endemic to their units. These however, did not preclude success in the training arena. To portray these results in tabular form the following findings are listed:

a. Eighty-six(86) percent of the commanders stated that training was based on the 25 series of manuals.

b. Seventy-nine (79) percent stated that they had received clear guidance from their senior headquarters.

c. Eighty-six(86) percent stated training was tough and realistic.

d. Thirty percent(30) stated redundant training to the same training areas degraded training. Primary comments supporting this came from combat support and combat service support commanders.

e. Forty-one(41) percent felt higher headquarters directives enhanced training.

f. Eighty-two(82) percent identified a training day that lasted from eight to eleven hours.

g. Thirty-six(36) percent agreed new soldiers possessed the basic MOS skills necessary for success.

h. Sixty-seven(67) percent agreed that the NCO Corps was capable of planning and conducting individual training to standards

i. Seventy-two(72) percent agreed that junior officers were able to plan and conduct small unit collective training.

This data reflects a support for the imperative as stated by the CSA, and reinforces executable guidance from senior headquarters. Tough, realistic training is well in the combat arms battalions. Combat support and combat service support units reflect no statistically significant differences further supporting the wellness of the force. This training capability is dependent as well on resources and their availability. The next section addresses those resources.

Resources are those "things" that enable a commander to accomplish his mission. They range from the finite, such as time, people and supplies to the infinite such as resources provided by others. They can be affected by the commander's attention or inattention. In order to support the Chief of Staff's imperatives as defined earlier, resources; and the act of resourcing, must support the commander.

As a group, the surveyed commanders strongly supported the availability and applicability of training and operating resources. Sixty-five (65) identified a direct role in the development of their command operating budget (COB). This budget, which for eighty-seven (87) percent of the commanders ranged

between one and five million dollars, was primarily driven by projected events (Sixty-five (65) percent of the respondents). Eighty-nine (89) percent found that managing this budget took twenty (20) percent of their time. While this number may not be significant in its' own right, it does represent time spent away from active leadership.

People, with attendant skills, the training day and resources all garnered positive responses from the group. New soldiers were rated by fifty-four (54) percent of the commanders to have the predicate soldier skills upon arrival from AIT necessary for success. Sixty-four (64) percent felt they had enough training days available to them while eighty-one (81) percent felt there were enough total resources to accomplish the assigned task. No statistically significant percentages supported the concerns that personnel turnover or lack of facilities limited training effectiveness.

Senior commanders received high marks for their involvement in resource management. Eighty-one (81) percent of the respondents identified their resources were shared with other like units; eighty-six (86) percent stated that their commanders actively cross-levelled critical shortages to maximize results.

Having articulated these cumulative statistics there is a need to address specific differences or anomalies.

Commanders of commands other than Combat Arms (CA), Combat Support (CS), or Combat Service Support (CSS) battalions; such as basic or AIT battalion commanders, stated that they had direct involvement in their COB development only forty-two (42) percent

of the time. This compares to an average of sixty-five (65) percent for the aforementioned group. While a significant difference, it probably represents who has preponderant responsibility for budget development. These "other" commands are most likely derivative or local adjuncts to parent units. In this context, proponentcy remains with the parent or senior headquarters.

All commanders commented on the impact of unfinanced requirements on training. Twenty-five (25) percent felt there was a definitive loss of training due to a shortage of funds. While no dollar cost was cited, it was inferred that it was large enough to preclude internal resolution by the unit.

Earlier comments supported basic soldier skill and competence. However, MOS shortages were noted as the single resource shortfall most impacting unit success. Seventy-seven (77) percent of the combat arms commanders singled this area out; with sixty-six (66) percent of the combat support, eighty-seven (87) percent of the combat service support, and sixty (60) percent of other commanders concurring. This unusually high number of CSS commanders would be in keeping with their mission requirements and MOS densities. To them, the shortage of even one individual is of critical note.

Reflecting on the statements above, those positive and negative, it can be said that available resources are supporting the development of the Army's imperatives. Commanders are taking an active part in identifying and utilizing assets to a maximum degree. When necessary, trade-offs are being made. In all cases

commanders felt comfortable with what they have and with what they are tasked to do with them. Given the seeming viability of the system, tomorrow's projected shortages will be met with confidence and resolution. Support for the continuance of the Army's Imperatives exists in the community of resources. In these, resources are the drivers for maintaining a quality force and developing leadership.

The perspective of the former battalion commanders surveyed concerning the Army Imperatives to "Maintain a Quality Force" and to "Develop Competent, Confident Leaders" was assessed through their responses to one set of questions that asked them to rate several rank groupings on a scale of 10 to 1 concerning the ability of the members of these groups to learn, their competence and their enthusiasm and through their responses to a second set of questions that required them to agree or disagree to a series of statements that ranged from drug and alcohol abuse to the doctrinal knowledge of junior officers. Since a quality force includes competent, confident leaders, the responses to these questions will be addressed in three subpopulations of the force based on rank (officer leaders, NCO leaders and soldiers) not tied strictly to each imperative.

The core evaluation of this section of the survey results is based on three questions that asked the respondent to rate, on a scale of 1 (low) to 10 (high), 8 rank groupings (field grade officers, company grade officers, warrant officers, CSMs, MSG/1SGs, SFCs, SSG/SGTs, CPL/SPCs and below) on three attributes, their competence, their enthusiasm or drive and their



ability to learn. In general the results were encouraging in that the mean scores for each group in each attribute area were in the top third of the scale (all means were in the range 6.7 to 8.9) with standard deviations indicating a reasonable degree of coherence (from 1.14 to 1.88) with one significant exception which will be discussed later. The trends within each attribute also seem to indicate consistency. The enlisted grades steadily increased in competence from CPL/SPC through CSM while warrant officers and field grades show higher competence than company grades. The scores for enthusiasm and ability to learn, on the other hand both decreased from CPL/SPC to SFC, then increased at the 1SG/MSG level with a subsequent decrease to CSM. In the officer ranks, warrant officers rate lowest in these two areas followed by field grades with company grades being given the highest scores for their enthusiasm and their ability to learn.

Overall, the officer corps was well regarded by the surveyed former battalion commanders. When given the opportunity to Strongly Agree, Agree, be Neutral, Disagree or Strongly Disagree with the statement "The officer corps possessed satisfactory moral and ethical standards" over 93% either agreed or strongly agreed while only 2.7% disagreed (no strong disagreement). When given the same response options to the statement "Drug/alcohol use among officers was a significant problem" only 2.7% agreed (no strong agreement) while almost 92% disagreed or strongly disagreed. Turning now to the performance of field grade officers in the three core attribute areas. The mean of their competence scores (8.35) is the highest of all rank groupings

while they come in second to company grade officers in both enthusiasm (8.38) and ability to learn (8.44). As an excursion, the survey results were analyzed to account for the fact that respondents to the survey used different scales (some gave scores in the 8 to 10 range, some 4 to 9, some 1 to 4, etc.). The excursion methodology was to select the maximum and minimum score that each respondent gave to a given attribute area and then recode the responses for each rank grouping in that attribute area to one of three values, maximum, minimum or somewhere in the middle. The results of this analysis for the field grade group are consistent with the base analysis for enthusiasm and ability to learn in that field grades received the second highest number of maximum scores (the highest going to company grades) and the second lowest number of minimum scores (the lowest again going to company grades). There is an anomaly with regards to the competence area in that CSMs received more maximum competence scores than the field grades however the field grades received the lowest number of minimum scores. This anomaly will be addressed as a part of the CSM discussion. In summary, the field grade group was looked on as the most consistently competent group and was considered slightly less enthusiastic than the eager young company grade officers.

Moving on to the company grade officers, although they are regarded as the least competent officer category, their mean score (7.67) was higher than that of all NCO categories except CSMs. Using the excursion methodology described above, approximately two thirds of the respondents rated these officers

in the middle with the remaining third split two thirds in the maximum category and one third in the minimum. As previously stated in the field grade section, company grade officers received the highest scores for both their ability to learn (8.92) and their enthusiasm (8.64). There were four agree/disagree type questions concerning these officers. These questions were oriented on the skills necessary for success in unit type assignments. 78% of the former battalion commanders surveyed either strongly agreed or agreed with "junior officers were able to plan and conduct small unit collective training," while only 7.9% disagreed (there were 2 strongly disagree responses). Similarly 72% agreed with "The junior officer corps had sufficient skills and overall professional knowledge to carry out its training responsibilities," while 14% disagreed (including 5 that strongly disagreed). They also received 78.4% agreement that "company grade officers understood organizational structure and relationships," with 11% disagreement (no strong disagreement). Significantly, only 49.4% agreed with "the junior officer corps was sufficiently grounded in doctrinal unit operations," while 29.5% disagreed (with 6 strong disagreements). In summary the responses to the survey depict company grade officers as bright and energetic, well able to carry out unit training responsibilities but with insufficient grounding in doctrine.

Warrant officers scored well in the competence attribute with the second highest mean (8.21), however their scores for enthusiasm (7.36) and ability to learn (7.73) were not as good.

This enthusiasm score is among the lowest scores achieved (SFC score was 7.24 and SSG/SGT 7.34) in this area. The ability to learn score is in the middle, exceeded by the other officer groups and CPL/SPC, equal to SSG/SGT and higher than the remaining NCO groups (SFC, MSG/1SG and CSM). This would seem to describe warrant officers as competent technicians, with little enthusiasm and an alarmingly low ability to learn.

There were four agree/disagree type questions that addressed the entire spectrum of noncommissioned officers. Two were similar to the ones concerning the officer corps. 78.9% agreed (or strongly agreed) that "The NCO corps possessed satisfactory moral and ethical standards." while 5.9% disagreed (there were no strong disagreements). The next statement, "Drug/alcohol use among the NCO corps was a significant problem." generated 15.7% agreement and 71% disagreement (including 20% strong disagreement). The next two statements addressed the ability of NCOs to conduct training. 72.8% agreed with "The NCO Corps was able to plan and conduct individual training to standard." while 19.1% disagreed (only 6 responses showed strong disagreement). "The NCO Corps had sufficient knowledge and ability to carry out its training responsibilities." elicited 68% agreement and 18.4% disagreement (strong feelings accounted for 11.7% of the agreement and only 3.5% of the disagreement). It is interesting to note that the agreement rate of former commanders of CSS battalions was 10% lower for both questions involving the NCO corps ability to train. One other agree/disagree question of interest stated "Junior enlisted soldiers were on the average

better educated than the senior NCOs." The reaction to this statement was mixed with approximately 37% agreeing and 37% disagreeing.

There is an apparent paradox in the scores achieved by Command Sergeants Major in the three attributes that were measured. As reported previously they were rated highest of all NCO grades for competence (7.83), second for enthusiasm (7.69) and lowest for ability to learn (7.2). However the standard deviations associated with these scores are greater than any of the other scores (2.13, 2.25 and 2.37 compared to the range for the rest of the scores 1.14 - 1.88). Because of this indication of disparity the excursion methodology explained above was developed. It showed that for competence command sergeants major received more maximums than any other group as well as more minimums than any group except the junior enlisted. The results for enthusiasm are not quite so striking in that they received more maximums than all the other enlisted and the warrant officer categories and approximately the same number of minimums as these same groups. As far as their perceived ability to learn, they received more minimum scores than any other group and fewer maximums than all three officer groups as well as less than the junior enlisted group. This seems to indicate a "love/hate" relationship between battalion commanders and their command sergeants major. This is borne out by several handwritten comments on the surveys such as "I had two CSMs, a 10 and a 1".

The remaining noncommissioned officer categories present no surprises. Master Sergeants and First Sergeants were considered

to be more competent (7.56) than any NCO group other than CSMs, more enthusiastic (7.79) than any other group except company and field grade officers and an ability to learn (7.34) slightly higher than CSMs and SFCs. Sergeants First Class were rated lower in competence (7.17) than the more senior groups and higher than the junior groups. They received the lowest score of any group for enthusiasm (7.24) and next to the lowest (7.25) for their ability to learn. Finally, Sergeants and Staff Sergeants competence score (6.74) was slightly above the junior enlisted score, their enthusiasm (7.34) slightly below the junior enlisted, and their ability to learn (7.75), midway between Sergeants First Class and the junior enlisted. In general this creates a picture of the NCO Corps as a quality element of the force able to accomplish its training responsibilities. However there is also the indication of some disturbing trends including the apparent split of the CSM population into two categories, very good and very bad; the perception of shortfalls in the ability of CSS NCOs to conduct training; and the downward slide in enthusiasm and ability to learn as NCOs became more senior.

The attitudes of former battalion commanders concerning junior enlisted soldiers was evaluated using three agree/disagree type questions and responses concerning the same three attributes that were assessed for the various categories of leaders. They received the lowest score for competence (6.7), scored higher than the SSG/SGT, SFC and warrant officer categories for enthusiasm (7.55) and higher than all categories except commissioned officers for their ability to learn (8.25). The

statement "Newly arrived soldiers had basic mastery of soldier skills." was agreed to by 56.1% and disagreed to by 29.8% (in both cases strong feelings accounted for 4% of the total). Next, the statement "Newly arrived soldiers were trained to standard in their MOS related skills." only achieved a 36.2% agreement level and a 43.3% disagreement level (again strong feelings were not significant accounting for approximately 3% of each total). Finally, 17.6% of the responses indicated agreement with "Drug/alcohol use among junior enlisted soldiers was a significant problem." while 71.9% disagreed. In this case 20% indicated strong disagreement with the statement. This creates the picture of a junior enlisted force that is well regarded by its leaders but probably not as well trained as the leaders would like.

The opinion of former battalion commanders as measured by this survey is that the Imperative calling for competent, confident leaders is being met by the Army. There is some cause for concern over the lack of enthusiasm and ability to learn attributed to the warrant officer population. The fact that these levels are roughly equivalent to those of the SSG/SGT subpopulation might indicate there may not be enough of a transition when warrants are appointed from these grades. The steady decline in both enthusiasm and the ability to learn from junior enlisted through SFC and then the increase from SFC to MSG/1SG may reflect a perception of stifled opportunity that is overcome after an NCO is selected for promotion to MSG/1SG. Of most concern, is the division of the command sergeant major

population into a very good segment and a very bad segment. This could reflect the difference between self-fulfilling NCOs and externally motivated ones. Having evaluated the leadership and soldier quality aspects of the Imperative, "Maintain a Quality Force", attention is now given to the field's evaluation of the collective task portion of this Imperative.

Thirty-two(32) questions were designed to measure the degree of success the Army was having in executing this imperative. These questions addressed command culture, climate, and environment and used as their definitions the following:

COMMAND CULTURE: Shared values that validate the existence of shared experiences, self-regulating units, reduced need for explicit control enhancing organizational flexibility.

COMMAND CLIMATE: A shared perception among the members of a unit about what life is like; Fair and challenges the organization to do its best.

COMMAND ENVIRONMENT: The aggregate of surrounding things, conditions, or influences; A combination of physical climate, social influences, military condition, and surrounding culture.

The majority of all commanders, regardless of branch, either agreed or strongly agreed that the Army's climate was positive and reinforcing, supporting the maintenance of a quality force. Specifically they cited:

a. Eighty-two(82) percent felt the command climate on their installation to be supportive.

b. Eighty-two(82) percent felt the chain of commands' values matched theirs.



c. Eighty-two(82) percent felt the chain of command supported accurate reporting.

d. Eighty(80) percent felt the senior commanders would support them in difficult times.

e. Eighty-eight(88) percent felt the chain of command was fair.

f. Eighty-four(84) percent they had the freedom to command in their own way.

Further reinforcing the statistical data were the narrative comments:

a. Three of four brigade commanders were outstanding.

b. Brigade commanders were excellent.

c. First OER review with a senior rater in twenty years.

d. Training environment--- best in twenty-two years.

e. Best job I ever had.

f. Division commander superb trainer--- understood the Army system.

Negative responses as to the viability of this imperative were in the minority. These appeared to be the results of individual experiences and did not reflect any trends. Of the twenty-six(26) written comments, seven(7) addressed their senior raters never visiting their units. Other comments included:

a. Too much interference, no priorities.

b. Division commander was a micro-manager.

c. Senior rater did not know me.

d. Rater was self-serving.

e. Mentoring, a non-program.

f. Division commander lost sight of his own goals and values.

Overall, commanders support the perception that the imperative is viable, that the climate of command is positive in the force as a whole, and that a quality force is being maintained.

### CONCLUSIONS

What then are the conclusions that can be drawn from this work?

a. That the instrument design is valid.

b. That administering the survey and collecting the data is free from complexity.

c. That the field has an interest in providing feedback as to their experiences.

d. That guidelines such as "Imperatives" are, in many cases, quantifiable and measurable.

e. That, in the case of this study, those imperatives measured have translated to application in the field and the field is robust.

f. That the library of questions has applicability over time.

### RECOMMENDATIONS

Recognizing a need for continued study and interest we make the following recommendations. It would be presumed that future users could work the data to either form or reinforce the perception of wellness in the force. The recommendations are:

a. Continue the survey and attempt to monitor trends from year to year. To do this there must be a core survey that is

unchanged or is at least translatable from one year to the next.

b. Consider looking at the situation regarding CSMs to see if there is a personnel management technique that can recognize the long and valued service of these NCOs while limiting the impact a "bad" one has on a unit.

c. Survey related:

- Establish a category for BCT/AIT battalion commanders and segregate them from the remainder of the population.

- Do not survey "other" commanders. This was a catch all that included contracting and other "administrative type" commands. Their experiences are not homogeneous with troop unit commands (either TOE or TDA).

d. Include the survey as a part of Course 1 and provide the results to the class for discussion.

e. Provide the results to school proponents for use in Pre-Command Course curricula.

f. Use the results, if applicable, to correct weak or broken field systems.

The Chief of Staffs' Imperatives have translated to the field. They are being adhered to, and the force is the best it has been in history. There needs to be an outlet for dialogue and statement of experience; commanders must have a forum for reporting back. This instrument provides that forum, it captures the best and the brightest's perceptions and knowledge. Continued application of this procedure can only benefit the service as a whole.

**Tab A**

## Appendix A SPSS/PC Program

SET SCREEN=OFF/PRINTER=OFF/LENGTH=55/MORE=OFF/PTRANSLATE=OFF.

TITLE FORMER BATTALION COMMANDER SURVEY, 1991.

DATA LIST FILE='SURVEYX'

/Q01 TO Q39 3-41 Q41 TO Q75 43-77 Q79 81/Q81 TO Q99 03-21 RNUM  
22-24.

VARIABLE LABELS

Q01 'TYPE BATTALION'  
/Q02 'AGE ASSUMED COMMAND'  
/Q03 'TYPE UNIT'  
/Q04 'LENGTH OF COMMAND'  
/Q05 'YEAR GROUP'  
/Q06 'YEAR LEFT COMMAND'  
/Q07 'PERCENT WOMEN SOLDIERS'  
/Q08 'PERCENT WOMEN OFFICERS'  
/Q09 'UNIT CODED TO PRECLUDE WOMEN'  
/Q10 'COMMAND LOCATION'  
/Q11 'ACCOMPANIED TOUR'  
/Q12 'LIVED ON POST'  
/Q13 'SPOUSE PARTICIPATION'  
/Q14 'SPOUSE EMPLOYMENT'  
/Q15 'DIRECT INPUT IN DEVELOPING COB'  
/Q16 'PERCENT TIME ON BUDGET MANAGEMENT'  
/Q17 'ENOUGH AMMUNITION FOR STRAC'  
/Q18 'SUFFICIENT TRAINING FUNDS'  
/Q19 'AVERAGE PERSONNEL TURNOVER RATE'

/Q20 'AVAILABILITY OF TRAINING RESOURCES'  
/Q21 'UFRS INHIBITED TRAINING'  
/Q22 'ALO'  
/Q23 'CRITICAL RESOURCES SHARED'  
/Q24 'CRITICAL RESOURCES CROSSLEVELED'  
/Q25 'OTHER UNITS WITH HIGHER PRIORITY'  
/Q26 'FACILITY AVAIL DEGRADED TRAINING'  
/Q27 'MOS SHORTAGES DEGRADED EFFECTIVENESS'  
/Q28 'TOTAL COB'  
/Q29 'ALO CONSTRAINED READINESS'  
/Q30 'REPAIR PARTS REQUISITIONS DEFERRED'  
/Q31 'BASIS FOR BUDGET'  
/Q32 'SUFFICIENT RESOURCES FOR TRAINING'  
/Q33 'TRAINING DEVELOPMENT BASED ON 25 SERIES'  
/Q34 'CLEAR TRNG GUIDANCE FROM SENIOR HQ'  
/Q35 'TRNG GUIDANCE SUPPORTED TOUGH TRNG'  
/Q36 'SAME TRNG AREAS DEGRADED TRNG'  
/Q37 'FREQUENCY OF OFF POST TRNG'  
/Q38 'TRNG BASED ON MTPS'  
/Q39 'MTPS PROVIDED BASIS FOR TOUGH TRNG'  
/Q41 'HIGHER HQ CHANGES HINDERED TRNG'  
/Q42 'HIGHER HQ DIRECTIVES ENHANCED TRNG'  
/Q43 'TRNG INCLUDED COMBINED ARMS AND SLICE'  
/Q44 'TRNG WAS JOINT'  
/Q45 'NCOS ABILITY TO PLAN AND CONDUCT TRNG'  
/Q46 'OK TO TRANSFR INDIV TRNG FROM AIT TO UNIT'  
/Q47 'BNCOC/ANCOC IMPROVED CAPABILITY TO TRN'

/Q48 'JR OFF ABLE TO PLAN, CONDUCT TRNG'  
/Q49 'SCENARIOS AT CTC SUPPORTED ALB'  
/Q50 'CTC PERFORMANCE ON OER'  
/Q51 'NUMBER OF CTC ROTATIONS'  
/Q52 'FREQUENCY OF QTBS'  
/Q53 'ATTAIN STDS FOR INDIV MARKSMENSHIP'  
/Q54 'FREQUENCY OF PT PER WEEK'  
/Q55 'LENGTH OF GARRISON DUTY DAY'  
/Q56 'OFF PROF DEV PROGRAM'  
/Q57 'HAD SUFFICIENT TRNG DAYS'  
/Q58 'NEW SOLDIERS HAD BASIC SOLDIER SKILLS'  
/Q59 'NEW SOLDIERS HAD BASIC MOS SKILLS'  
/Q60 'NCOS KNOW AND ABIL TO TRAIN'  
/Q61 'JR OFF SKILL AND KNOW TO TRAIN'  
/Q62 'JR OFF GROUNDED IN UNIT DOCTRINE'  
/Q63 'LEAVENWORTH PCC ADEQUATE'  
/Q64 'BRANCH PCC ADEQUATE'  
/Q65 'JR SOLDIERS BETTER EDUCATED THAN NCOS'  
/Q66 'OFF UNDERSTOOD ORG STRUC AND RELTN'  
/Q67 'POST COMMAND CLIMATE SATISFACTORY'  
/Q68 'CHAIN OF COMMAND VALUES MATCHED YOURS'  
/Q69 'COC SUPPORTED ACCURATE REPORTING'  
/Q70 'ACCURATE ASSESSMENTS AND REPORTS UP'  
/Q71 'NCO MORAL AND ETHICAL STDS SAT'  
/Q72 'OFF MORAL AND ETHICAL STDS SAT'  
/Q73 "DRUG/ALCOHOL PROBLEM FOR JR EM"  
/Q74 "DRUG/ALCOHOL PROBLEM FOR NCOS"

/Q75 "DRUG/ALCOHOL PROBLEM FOR OFF"  
 /Q79 'UCMJ ACTIONS PER MONTH'  
 /Q81 'FREQ MENTORED BY CDR'  
 /Q82 'FREQ COUNSELED SUBORDINATES'  
 /Q83 'FREQ POSITIVE WRITTEN COUNSELING'  
 /Q84 'YOUR FREEDOM TO COMMAND'  
 /Q85 'YOUR SUBORDINATES FREEDOM TO CMD'  
 /Q86 'IMPORTANCE OF STATISTICS'  
 /Q87 'YOUR SENIOR RATER PROFILE KNOWN'  
 /Q88 'DISCUSS RATINGS WITH SUBORDINATES'  
 /Q89 "YOUR SENIOR RATER'S PROFILE KNOWN"  
 /Q90 'RATER DISCUSSED YOUR REPORT PRIOR'  
 /Q91 'SR RTR DISCUSSED YOUR REPORT PRIOR'  
 /Q92 'SUPPORT FROM HIGHER HEADQUARTERS'  
 /Q93 'HIGHER CDRS KNEW YOUR UNIT STATUS'  
 /Q94 'FREQ OF IMMEDIATE CDR VISITS'  
 /Q95 'SENIOR CDRS WOULD SPT IN HARD TIMES'  
 /Q96 'SAT CMD CLIMATE FROM HIGHER HQ'  
 /Q97 'CHAIN OF CMD FAIR TO COMMANDERS'  
 /Q98 'HOW POSITIVE ABOUT ARMY CAREER'  
 /Q99 'SENIOR SERVICE COLLEGE ATTENDED'.

#### VALUE LABELS

/Q01 1 'COMBAT ARMS' 2 'COMBAT SUPPORT' 3 'COMBAT SERVICE SPT' 4  
 'OTHER'  
 /Q02 1 'UNDER 35' 2 '35-37' 3 '38-40' 4 '41-43' 5 '44-46'  
 /Q03 1 'SEPARATE' 2 'SEPARATE BRIGADE' 3 'DIVISIONAL' 4 'CORPS'  
 5 'EAC' 6 'OTHER'



/Q04 1 'UNDER 18 MO' 2 '18-23 MO' 3 '24-30 MO' 4 '30-36 MO' 5  
 '37 OR MORE MO'  
 /Q05 1 '1966' 2 '1967' 3 '1968' 4 '1969' 5 '1970' 6 '1971' 7  
 '1972'  
 /Q06 1 'BEFORE 1988' 2 '1988' 3 '1989' 4 '1990'  
 /Q07 1 'NONE' 2 "<10%" 3 "10-19%" 4 "20-29%" 5 ">30%"  
 /Q08 1 'NONE' 2 "<10%" 3 "10-19%" 4 "20-29%" 5 ">30%"  
 /Q09 1 'YES' 2 'NO' 3 'DONT KNOW'  
 /Q10 1 'CONUS' 2 'EUROPE' 3 'KOREA' 4 'PANAMA' 5 'ALASKA' 6  
 'HAWAII' 7 'OTHER'  
 /Q11 1 'YES WITH SPOUSE' 2 'YES WITHOUT SPOUSE' 3 'NO' 4 "N/A"  
 /Q12 1 'YES' 2 'NO'  
 /Q13 1 'ALMOST NEVER' 2 'SELDOM' 3 'SOMETIMES' 4 'FREQUENTLY' 5  
 'ALMOST ALWAYS'  
 /Q14 1 'FULL TIME' 2 'PART TIME' 3 'NOT OUTSIDE HOME'  
 /Q15 1 'YES' 2 'SOMETIMES' 3 'NO'  
 /Q16 1 "<10%" 2 "11-20%" 3 "21-30%" 4 "31-40%" 5 "41-50%" 6  
 ">50%"  
 /Q17 1 'YES' 2 'NO' 3 'NA'  
 /Q18 1 'ALMOST NEVER' 2 'SELDOM' 3 'SOMETIMES' 4 'FREQUENTLY' 5  
 'ALMOST ALWAYS'  
 /Q19 1 "<10%" 2 "11-15%" 3 "16-20%" 4 "21-25%" 5 "26-30%" 6  
 ">30%"  
 /Q20 1 'ALMOST NEVER' 2 'SELDOM' 3 'SOMETIMES' 4 'FREQUENTLY' 5  
 'ALMOST ALWAYS'  
 /Q21 1 'ALMOST NEVER' 2 'SELDOM' 3 'SOMETIMES' 4 'FREQUENTLY' 5  
 'ALMOST ALWAYS'

/Q22 1 '1' 2 '2' 3 '3' 4 'NA'

/Q23 1 'DONT KNOW' 2 'NOT AT ALL' 3 'SLIGHTLY' 4 'MODERATELY' 5  
'GREATLY'

/Q24 1 'DONT KNOW' 2 'NOT AT ALL' 3 'SLIGHTLY' 4 'MODERATELY' 5  
'GREATLY'

/Q25 1 'YES' 2 'NO'

/Q26 1 'DONT KNOW' 2 'NOT AT ALL' 3 'SLIGHTLY' 4 'MODERATELY' 5  
'GREATLY'

/Q27 1 'DONT KNOW' 2 'NOT AT ALL' 3 'SLIGHTLY' 4 'MODERATELY' 5  
'GREATLY'

/Q28 1 "<\$1 M" 2 "\$1-5 M" 3 "\$6-10 M" 4 ">\$10 M"

/Q29 1 'STRONGLY AGREE' 2 'AGREE' 3 'NEUTRAL' 4 'DISAGREE' 5  
'STRONGLY DISAGREE'

/Q30 1 'ALMOST NEVER' 2 'SELDOM' 3 'SOMETIMES' 4 'FREQUENTLY' 5  
'ALMOST ALWAYS'

/Q31 1 'PROJECTED EVENTS' 2 'PRIOR EXPENDITURES' 3 'OTHER'

/Q32 1 'ALL I DESIRED' 2 'MOST I DESIRED' 3 'ONLY REQUIRED' 4  
'LESS THAN REQUIRED' 5 'MUCH LESS'

/Q33 TO Q36 1 'STRONGLY AGREE' 2 'AGREE' 3 'NEUTRAL' 4  
'DISAGREE' 5 'STRONGLY DISAGREE'

/Q37 1 'ALMOST NEVER' 2 'SELDOM' 3 'SOMETIMES' 4 'FREQUENTLY' 5  
'ALMOST ALWAYS'

/Q38 TO Q39 1 'STRONGLY AGREE' 2 'AGREE' 3 'NEUTRAL' 4  
'DISAGREE' 5 'STRONGLY DISAGREE'

/Q41 1 'ALMOST NEVER' 2 'SELDOM' 3 'SOMETIMES' 4 'FREQUENTLY' 5  
'ALMOST ALWAYS'

/Q42 1 'STRONGLY AGREE' 2 'AGREE' 3 'NEUTRAL' 4 'DISAGREE' 5  
'STRONGLY DISAGREE'

/Q43 1 'ALMOST NEVER' 2 'SELDOM' 3 'SOMETIMES' 4 'FREQUENTLY' 5  
'ALMOST ALWAYS'

/Q44 1 'ALMOST NEVER' 2 'SELDOM' 3 'SOMETIMES' 4 'FREQUENTLY' 5  
'ALMOST ALWAYS'

/Q45 TO Q49 1 'STRONGLY AGREE' 2 'AGREE' 3 'NEUTRAL' 4  
'DISAGREE' 5 'STRONGLY DISAGREE'

/Q50 1 'YES, EXPLICITLY' 2 'YES, IMPLICITLY' 3 'NO' 4  
'DONT KNOW'

/Q51 1 'NONE' 2 '1' 3 '2' 4 '3' 5 '4 OR MORE' 6 'NA'

/Q52 1 'NEVER' 2 'ANNUALLY' 3 'SEMI-ANNUALLY' 4 'QUARTERLY' 5  
'MORE THAN QUARTERLY'

/Q53 1 'NEVER' 2 'SELDOM' 3 'SOMETIMES' 4 'FREQUENTLY' 5  
'ALMOST ALWAYS' 6 'NA'

/Q54 1 "<3 PER WEEK" 2 '3 PER WEEK' 3 '4 PER WEEK' 4  
'5 PER WEEK'

/Q55 1 "<8 HOURS" 2 "8-9 HOURS" 3 "10-11 HOURS" 4 "12 HOURS" 5  
">12 HOURS"

/Q56 1 'YES' 2 'NO'

/Q57 TO Q75 1 'STRONGLY AGREE' 2 'AGREE' 3 'NEUTRAL' 4  
'DISAGREE' 5 'STRONGLY DISAGREE'

/Q79 1 "0-5" 2 "6-10" 3 "11-15" 4 ">15"

/Q81 TO Q83 1 'DAILY' 2 'WEEKLY' 3 'MONTHLY' 4 'QUARTERLY' 5  
'ANNUALLY' 6 'AT OER TIME' 7 'NEVER'

/Q84 TO Q85 1 'LOW' 2 'MODERATE' 3 'HIGH'

/Q86 1 'NO IMPORTANCE' 2 'NOT ENOUGH' 3 'ABOUT RIGHT' 4

'A LITTLE TOO MUCH' 5 'ENTIRELY TOO MUCH'  
 /Q87 TO Q91 1 'YES' 2 'NO'  
 /Q92 TO Q93 1 'VERY DISSATISFIED' 2 'DISSATISFIED' 3  
 'BORDERLINE' 4 'SATISFIED' 5 'VERY SATISFIED'  
 /Q94 1 'NEVER' 2 'WEEKLY' 3 'MONTHLY' 4 'QUARTERLY' 5  
 'SEMI-ANNUALLY' 6 'ANNUALLY' 7 'LESS THAN ANNUALLY'  
 /Q95 TO Q96 1 'STRONGLY AGREE' 2 'AGREE' 3 'NEUTRAL' 4  
 'DISAGREE' 5 'STRONGLY DISAGREE'  
 /Q97 1 'YES' 2 'NO'  
 /Q98 1 'MUCH MORE POSITIVELY' 2 'MORE POSITIVELY' 3  
 'ABOUT THE SAME' 4 'LESS POSITIVELY' 5 'MUCH LESS POSITIVELY'  
 /Q99 1 'ARMY WAR COLLEGE' 2 'NAVAL WAR COLLEGE' 3  
 'AIR WAR COLLEGE' 4 'NATIONAL WAR COLLEGE' 5 'ICAF'.  
 SET BLANKS = 0.  
 RECODE Q01 TO Q99 (0=SYSMIS).  
 RECODE Q58 TO Q75 (1=5) (2=4) (4=2) (5=1).  
 RECODE Q95 TO Q96 (1=5) (2=4) (4=2) (5=1).  
 CROSSTABS TABLES=Q03 BY Q01  
 /OPTIONS=4.  
 CROSSTABS TABLES=Q06 BY Q01  
 /OPTIONS=4.  
 CROSSTABS TABLES=Q10 BY Q01  
 /OPTIONS=4.  
 CROSSTABS TABLES=Q99 BY Q01  
 /OPTIONS=4.  
 sub 'COMBAT ARMS BATTALIONS'.  
 PROCESS IF (Q01=1).

```
FREQUENCIES VARIABLES= Q11 TO Q39
/STATISTICS.
sub 'COMBAT ARMS BATTALIONS'.
PROCESS IF (Q01=1).
FREQUENCIES VARIABLES= Q41 TO Q75
/STATISTICS.
sub 'COMBAT ARMS BATTALIONS'.
PROCESS IF (Q01=1).
FREQUENCIES VARIABLES= Q79
/STATISTICS.
sub 'COMBAT ARMS BATTALIONS'.
PROCESS IF (Q01=1).
FREQUENCIES VARIABLES = Q81 TO Q98
/STATISTICS.
SUB 'COMBAT SUPPORT BATTALIONS'.
PROCESS IF (Q01=2).
FREQUENCIES VARIABLES= Q11 TO Q39
/STATISTICS.
SUB 'COMBAT SUPPORT BATTALIONS'.
PROCESS IF (Q01=2).
FREQUENCIES VARIABLES= Q41 TO Q75
/STATISTICS.
SUB 'COMBAT SUPPORT BATTALIONS'.
PROCESS IF (Q01=2).
FREQUENCIES VARIABLES= Q79
/STATISTICS.
SUB 'COMBAT SUPPORT BATTALIONS'.
```

```
PROCESS IF (Q01=2).  
FREQUENCIES VARIABLES = Q81 TO Q98  
/STATISTICS.  
SUB 'COMBAT SERVICE SUPPORT BATTALIONS'.  
PROCESS IF (Q01=3).  
FREQUENCIES VARIABLES= Q11 TO Q39  
/STATISTICS.  
SUB 'COMBAT SERVICE SUPPORT BATTALIONS'.  
PROCESS IF (Q01=3).  
FREQUENCIES VARIABLES= Q41 TO Q75  
/STATISTICS.  
SUB 'COMBAT SERVICE SUPPORT BATTALIONS'.  
PROCESS IF (Q01=3).  
FREQUENCIES VARIABLES= Q79  
/STATISTICS.  
SUB 'COMBAT SERVICE SUPPORT BATTALIONS'.  
PROCESS IF (Q01=3).  
FREQUENCIES VARIABLES = Q81 TO Q98  
/STATISTICS.  
SUB 'OTHER COMMANDS'.  
PROCESS IF (Q01=4).  
FREQUENCIES VARIABLES= Q11 TO Q39  
/STATISTICS.  
SUB 'OTHER COMMANDS'.  
PROCESS IF (Q01=4).  
FREQUENCIES VARIABLES= Q41 TO Q75  
/STATISTICS.
```

```
SUB 'OTHER COMMANDS'.  
PROCESS IF (Q01=4).  
FREQUENCIES VARIABLES= Q79  
/STATISTICS.  
SUB 'OTHER COMMANDS'.  
PROCESS IF (Q01=4).  
FREQUENCIES VARIABLES = Q81 TO Q98  
/STATISTICS.
```

**Tab B**



# Appendix B - Survey Results, Former Battalion Commander Survey

## Part I - Demographic Information

Crosstabulation: Q03 TYPE UNIT  
By Q01 TYPE BATTALION

Q01-Q	Count Col Pct	COMBAT A RMS 1	COMBAT S UPPORT 2	COMBAT S ERVICE S 3	OTHER 4	Row Total
Q03						
SEPARATE	1	8 5.9	4 8.9		3 14.3	15 5.9
SEPARATE BRIGADE	2	21 15.6	2 4.4	4 7.3		27 10.5
DIVISIONAL	3	87 64.4	14 31.1	19 34.5	2 9.5	122 47.7
CORPS	4	13 9.6	10 22.2	16 29.1		39 15.2
EAC	5	1 .7	11 24.4	5 9.1		17 6.6
OTHER	6	5 3.7	4 8.9	11 20.0	16 76.2	36 14.1
Column Total		135 52.7	45 17.6	55 21.5	21 8.2	256 100.0

Number of Missing Observations = 2

Part I - Demographic Information (Cont)

Crosstabulation: Q06 YEAR LEFT COMMAND  
By Q01 TYPE BATTALION

Q01-Q	Count Col Pct	COMBAT A RMS 1	COMBAT S UPPORT 2	COMBAT S ERVICE S 3	OTHER 4	Row Total
Q06						
BEFORE 1988	1	4 3.0	1 2.2	4 7.3	2 9.5	11 4.3
1988	2	17 12.6	4 8.9	5 9.1	1 4.8	27 10.5
1989	3	45 33.3	14 31.1	21 38.2	9 42.9	89 34.8
1990	4	68 50.4	26 57.8	24 43.6	9 42.9	127 49.6
	6	1 .7		1 1.8		2 .8
Column Total		135 52.7	45 17.6	55 21.5	21 8.2	256 100.0

Number of Missing Observations = 2

Part I - Demographic Information (Cont)

Crosstabulation: Q10 COMMAND LOCATION  
By Q01 TYPE BATTALION

Q01-Q10	Count Col Pct	COMBAT A RMS 1	COMBAT S UPPORT 2	COMBAT S ERVICE S 3	OTHER 4	Row Total
Q10						
CONUS	1	81 60.0	24 53.3	20 36.4	19 90.5	144 56.3
EUROPE	2	43 31.9	16 35.6	27 49.1	1 4.8	87 34.0
KOREA	3	4 3.0	2 4.4	4 7.3	1 4.8	11 4.3
PANAMA	4	1 .7				1 .4
ALASKA	5	4 3.0	1 2.2			5 2.0
HAWAII	6	2 1.5	1 2.2	3 5.5		6 2.3
OTHER	7		1 2.2	1 1.8		2 .8
Column Total		135 52.7	45 17.6	55 21.5	21 8.2	256 100.0

Number of Missing Observations = 2

Part I - Demographic Information (Cont)

Crosstabulation: Q99 SENIOR SERVICE COLLEGE ATTENDED  
By Q01 TYPE BATTALION

Q01-Q	Count Col Pct	COMBAT A RMS 1	COMBAT S UPPORT 2	COMBAT S ERVICE S 3	OTHER 4	Row Total
Q99						
1		67	29	27	14	137
ARMY WAR COLLEGE		49.6	64.4	49.1	66.7	53.5
2		15	4	4	5	28
NAVAL WAR COLLEG		11.1	8.9	7.3	23.8	10.9
3		9	3	2	1	15
AIR WAR COLLEGE		6.7	6.7	3.6	4.8	5.9
4		25	7			32
NATIONAL WAR COL		18.5	15.6			12.5
5		19	2	22	1	44
ICAF		14.1	4.4	40.0	4.8	17.2
Column Total		135 52.7	45 17.6	55 21.5	21 8.2	256 100.0

Number of Missing Observations = 2

Part II - Results for Commanders of Combat Arms Battalions

Q11 ACCOMPANIED TOUR

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
YES WITH SPOUSE	1	128	94.8	94.8	94.8
YES WITHOUT SPOUSE	2	2	1.5	1.5	96.3
NO	3	2	1.5	1.5	97.8
N/A	4	3	2.2	2.2	100.0
		-----	-----	-----	
	TOTAL	135	100.0	100.0	
Mean	1.111	Std Dev	.513	Minimum	1.000
Maximum	4.000				

Valid Cases 135 Missing Cases 0

Q12 LIVED ON POST

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
YES	1	90	66.7	66.7	66.7
NO	2	44	32.6	32.6	99.3
	5	1	.7	.7	100.0
		-----	-----	-----	
	TOTAL	135	100.0	100.0	
Mean	1.356	Std Dev	.566	Minimum	1.000
Maximum	5.000				

Valid Cases 135 Missing Cases 0

Part II - Commanders of Combat Arms Battalions (Cont)

Q13 SPOUSE PARTICIPATION

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
ALMOST NEVER	1	4	3.0	3.0	3.0
SELDOM	2	1	.7	.8	3.8
SOMETIMES	3	5	3.7	3.8	7.6
FREQUENTLY	4	26	19.3	19.7	27.3
ALMOST ALWAYS	5	96	71.1	72.7	100.0
	.	3	2.2	MISSING	
		-----	-----	-----	
	TOTAL	135	100.0	100.0	
Mean	4.583	Std Dev	.856	Minimum	1.000
Maximum	5.000				

Valid Cases 132 Missing Cases 3

Q14 SPOUSE EMPLOYMENT

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
FULL TIME	1	30	22.2	22.9	22.9
PART TIME	2	34	25.2	26.0	48.9
NOT OUTSIDE HOME	3	67	49.6	51.1	100.0
	.	4	3.0	MISSING	
		-----	-----	-----	
	TOTAL	135	100.0	100.0	
Mean	2.282	Std Dev	.816	Minimum	1.000
Maximum	3.000				

Valid Cases 131 Missing Cases 4

Part II - Commanders of Combat Arms Battalions (Cont)

Q15 DIRECT INPUT IN DEVELOPING COB

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
YES	1	85	63.0	63.9	63.9
SOMETIMES	2	23	17.0	17.3	81.2
NO	3	25	18.5	18.8	100.0
	.	2	1.5	MISSING	
		-----	-----	-----	
	TOTAL	135	100.0	100.0	
Mean	1.549	Std Dev	.793	Minimum	1.000
Maximum	3.000				

Valid Cases 133 Missing Cases 2

Q16 PERCENT TIME ON BUDGET MANAGEMENT

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
\$10%	1	97	71.9	72.4	72.4
11-20%	2	25	18.5	18.7	91.0
21-30%	3	8	5.9	6.0	97.0
31-40%	4	2	1.5	1.5	98.5
41-50%	5	2	1.5	1.5	100.0
	.	1	.7	MISSING	
		-----	-----	-----	
	TOTAL	135	100.0	100.0	
Mean	1.410	Std Dev	.797	Minimum	1.000
Maximum	5.000				

Valid Cases 134 Missing Cases 1

Part II - Commanders of Combat Arms Battalions (Cont)

Q17 ENOUGH AMMUNITION FOR STRAC

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
YES	1	87	64.4	64.9	64.9
NO	2	45	33.3	33.6	98.5
NA	3	1	.7	.7	99.3
	5	1	.7	.7	100.0
	.	1	.7	MISSING	
		-----	-----	-----	
	TOTAL	135	100.0	100.0	
Mean	1.381	Std Dev	.585	Minimum	1.000
Maximum	5.000				

Valid Cases 134 Missing Cases 1

Q18 SUFFICIENT TRAINING FUNDS

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
ALMOST NEVER	1	1	.7	.7	.7
SELDOM	2	7	5.2	5.2	5.9
SOMETIMES	3	13	9.6	9.6	15.6
FREQUENTLY	4	30	22.2	22.2	37.8
ALMOST ALWAYS	5	84	62.2	62.2	100.0
		-----	-----	-----	
	TOTAL	135	100.0	100.0	
Mean	4.400	Std Dev	.916	Minimum	1.000
Maximum	5.000				

Valid Cases 135 Missing Cases 0



Part II - Commanders of Combat Arms Battalions (Cont)

Q19 AVERAGE PERSONNEL TURNOVER RATE

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
\$10%	1	60	44.4	44.4	44.4
11-15%	2	59	43.7	43.7	88.1
16-20%	3	14	10.4	10.4	98.5
21-25%	4	1	.7	.7	99.3
26-30%	5	1	.7	.7	100.0
		-----	-----	-----	
	TOTAL	135	100.0	100.0	
Mean	1.704	Std Dev	.783	Minimum	1.000
Maximum	6.000				
Valid Cases	135	Missing Cases	0		

Q20 AVAILABILITY OF TRAINING RESOURCES

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
ALMOST NEVER	1	1	.7	.7	.7
SELDOM	2	5	3.7	3.7	4.4
SOMETIMES	3	24	17.8	17.8	22.2
FREQUENTLY	4	59	43.7	43.7	65.9
ALMOST ALWAYS	5	46	34.1	34.1	100.0
		-----	-----	-----	
	TOTAL	135	100.0	100.0	
Mean	4.067	Std Dev	.857	Minimum	1.000
Maximum	5.000				
Valid Cases	135	Missing Cases	0		

Part II - Commanders of Combat Arms Battalions (Cont)

Q21 UFRS INHIBITED TRAINING

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
ALMOST NEVER	1	53	39.3	39.8	39.8
SELDOM	2	45	33.3	33.8	73.7
SOMETIMES	3	27	20.0	20.3	94.0
FREQUENTLY	4	7	5.2	5.3	99.2
ALMOST ALWAYS	5	1	.7	.8	100.0
	.	2	1.5	MISSING	
		-----	-----	-----	
	TOTAL	135	100.0	100.0	
Mean	1.932	Std Dev	.939	Minimum	1.000
Maximum	5.000				

Valid Cases 133 Missing Cases 2

Q22 ALO

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
1	1	95	70.4	70.4	70.4
2	2	33	24.4	24.4	94.8
3	3	4	3.0	3.0	97.8
NA	4	2	1.5	1.5	99.3
	5	1	.7	.7	100.0
		-----	-----	-----	
	TOTAL	135	100.0	100.0	
Mean	1.378	Std Dev	.690	Minimum	1.000
Maximum	5.000				

Valid Cases 135 Missing Cases 0

Part II - Commanders of Combat Arms Battalions (Cont)

Q23 CRITICAL RESOURCES SHARED

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
DONT KNOW	1	6	4.4	4.4	4.4
NOT AT ALL	2	13	9.6	9.6	14.1
SLIGHTLY	3	54	40.0	40.0	54.1
MODERATELY	4	38	28.1	28.1	82.2
GREATLY	5	24	17.8	17.8	100.0
		-----	-----	-----	
	TOTAL	135	100.0	100.0	
Mean	3.452	Std Dev	1.035	Minimum	1.000
Maximum	5.000				
Valid Cases	135	Missing Cases	0		

Q24 CRITICAL RESOURCES CROSSLEVELED

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
DONT KNOW	1	3	2.2	2.2	2.2
NOT AT ALL	2	16	11.9	11.9	14.1
SLIGHTLY	3	50	37.0	37.0	51.1
MODERATELY	4	44	32.6	32.6	83.7
GREATLY	5	22	16.3	16.3	100.0
		-----	-----	-----	
	TOTAL	135	100.0	100.0	
Mean	3.489	Std Dev	.976	Minimum	1.000
Maximum	5.000				
Valid Cases	135	Missing Cases	0		

Part II - Commanders of Combat Arms Battalions (Cont)

Q25 OTHER UNITS WITH HIGHER PRIORITY

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
YES	1	44	32.6	32.8	32.8
NO	2	86	63.7	64.2	97.0
	3	3	2.2	2.2	99.3
	5	1	.7	.7	100.0
	.	1	.7	MISSING	
		-----	-----	-----	
	TOTAL	135	100.0	100.0	
Mean	1.716	Std Dev	.583	Minimum	1.000
Maximum	5.000				

Valid Cases 134 Missing Cases 1

Q26 FACILITY AVAIL DEGRADED TRAINING

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
NOT AT ALL	2	47	34.8	34.8	34.8
SLIGHTLY	3	60	44.4	44.4	79.3
MODERATELY	4	20	14.8	14.8	94.1
GREATLY	5	8	5.9	5.9	100.0
		-----	-----	-----	
	TOTAL	135	100.0	100.0	
Mean	2.919	Std Dev	.856	Minimum	2.000
Maximum	5.000				

Valid Cases 135 Missing Cases 0

Part II - Commanders of Combat Arms Battalions (Cont)

Q27 MOS SHORTAGES DEGRADED EFFECTIVENESS

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
DONT KNOW	1	1	.7	.7	.7
NOT AT ALL	2	28	20.7	20.7	21.5
SLIGHTLY	3	71	52.6	52.6	74.1
MODERATELY	4	30	22.2	22.2	96.3
GREATLY	5	5	3.7	3.7	100.0
		-----	-----	-----	
	TOTAL	135	100.0	100.0	
Mean	3.074	Std Dev	.779	Minimum	1.000
Maximum	5.000				
Valid Cases	135	Missing Cases	0		

Q28 TOTAL COB

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
\$\$1 M	1	52	38.5	39.7	39.7
\$1-5 M	2	72	53.3	55.0	94.7
\$6-10 M	3	3	2.2	2.3	96.9
¶\$10 M	4	4	3.0	3.1	100.0
	.	4	3.0	MISSING	
		-----	-----	-----	
	TOTAL	135	100.0	100.0	
Mean	1.687	Std Dev	.669	Minimum	1.000
Maximum	4.000				
Valid Cases	131	Missing Cases	4		

Part II - Commanders of Combat Arms Battalions (Cont)

Q29 ALO CONSTRAINED READINESS

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
STRONGLY AGREE	1	3	2.2	2.2	2.2
AGREE	2	9	6.7	6.7	8.9
NEUTRAL	3	12	8.9	8.9	17.8
DISAGREE	4	49	36.3	36.3	54.1
STRONGLY DISAGREE	5	62	45.9	45.9	100.0
		-----	-----	-----	
	TOTAL	135	100.0	100.0	
Mean	4.170	Std Dev	.997	Minimum	1.000
Maximum	5.000				
Valid Cases	135	Missing Cases	0		

Q30 REPAIR PARTS REQUISITIONS DEFERRED

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
ALMOST NEVER	1	82	60.7	60.7	60.7
SELDOM	2	16	11.9	11.9	72.6
SOMETIMES	3	27	20.0	20.0	92.6
FREQUENTLY	4	10	7.4	7.4	100.0
		-----	-----	-----	
	TOTAL	135	100.0	100.0	
Mean	1.741	Std Dev	1.022	Minimum	1.000
Maximum	4.000				
Valid Cases	135	Missing Cases	0		

Q31 BASIS FOR BUDGET

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
PROJECTED EVENTS	1	100	74.1	74.1	74.1
PRIOR EXPENDITURES	2	19	14.1	14.1	88.1
OTHER	3	15	11.1	11.1	99.3
	5	1	.7	.7	100.0
		-----	-----	-----	
	TOTAL	135	100.0	100.0	
Mean	1.393	Std Dev	.744	Minimum	1.000
Maximum	5.000				
Valid Cases	135	Missing Cases	0		

Part II - Commanders of Combat Arms Battalions (Cont)

Q32 SUFFICIENT RESOURCES FOR TRAINING

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
ALL I DESIRED	1	26	19.3	19.4	19.4
MOST I DESIRED	2	86	63.7	64.2	83.6
ONLY REQUIRED	3	12	8.9	9.0	92.5
LESS THAN REQUIRED	4	9	6.7	6.7	99.3
MUCH LESS	5	1	.7	.7	100.0
	.	1	.7	MISSING	
		-----	-----	-----	
	TOTAL	135	100.0	100.0	
Mean	2.052	Std Dev	.788	Minimum	1.000
Maximum	5.000				

Valid Cases 134 Missing Cases 1

Q33 TRAINING DEVELOPMENT BASED ON 25 SERIES

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
STRONGLY AGREE	1	74	54.8	55.2	55.2
AGREE	2	49	36.3	36.6	91.8
NEUTRAL	3	4	3.0	3.0	94.8
DISAGREE	4	7	5.2	5.2	100.0
	.	1	.7	MISSING	
		-----	-----	-----	
	TOTAL	135	100.0	100.0	
Mean	1.582	Std Dev	.788	Minimum	1.000
Maximum	4.000				

Valid Cases 134 Missing Cases 1

Part II - Commanders of Combat Arms Battalions (Cont)

Q34 CLEAR TRNG GUIDANCE FROM SENIOR HQ

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
STRONGLY AGREE	1	48	35.6	35.8	35.8
AGREE	2	60	44.4	44.8	80.6
NEUTRAL	3	13	9.6	9.7	90.3
DISAGREE	4	9	6.7	6.7	97.0
STRONGLY DISAGREE	5	4	3.0	3.0	100.0
	.	1	.7	MISSING	
		-----	-----	-----	
	TOTAL	135	100.0	100.0	
Mean	1.963	Std Dev	.999	Minimum	1.000
Maximum	5.000				

Valid Cases 134 Missing Cases 1

Q35 TRNG GUIDANCE SUPPORTED TOUGH TRNG

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
STRONGLY AGREE	1	70	51.9	52.2	52.2
AGREE	2	50	37.0	37.3	89.6
NEUTRAL	3	9	6.7	6.7	96.3
DISAGREE	4	5	3.7	3.7	100.0
	.	1	.7	MISSING	
		-----	-----	-----	
	TOTAL	135	100.0	100.0	
Mean	1.619	Std Dev	.774	Minimum	1.000
Maximum	4.000				

Valid Cases 134 Missing Cases 1



Part II - Commanders of Combat Arms Battalions (Cont)

Q36 SAME TRNG AREAS DEGRADED TRNG

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
STRONGLY AGREE	1	8	5.9	6.0	6.0
AGREE	2	37	27.4	27.6	33.6
NEUTRAL	3	27	20.0	20.1	53.7
DISAGREE	4	50	37.0	37.3	91.0
STRONGLY DISAGREE	5	12	8.9	9.0	100.0
	.	1	.7	MISSING	
	TOTAL	135	100.0	100.0	
Mean	3.157	Std Dev	1.109	Minimum	1.000
Maximum	5.000				

Valid Cases 134 Missing Cases 1

Q37 FREQUENCY OF OFF POST TRNG

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
ALMOST NEVER	1	1	.7	.7	.7
SELDOM	2	11	8.1	8.2	9.0
SOMETIMES	3	30	22.2	22.4	31.3
FREQUENTLY	4	59	43.7	44.0	75.4
ALMOST ALWAYS	5	33	24.4	24.6	100.0
	.	1	.7	MISSING	
	TOTAL	135	100.0	100.0	
Mean	3.836	Std Dev	.919	Minimum	1.000
Maximum	5.000				

Valid Cases 134 Missing Cases 1

Part II - Commanders of Combat Arms Battalions (Cont)

Q38 TRNG BASED ON MTPS

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
STRONGLY AGREE	1	37	27.4	27.4	27.4
AGREE	2	46	34.1	34.1	61.5
NEUTRAL	3	21	15.6	15.6	77.0
DISAGREE	4	23	17.0	17.0	94.1
STRONGLY DISAGREE	5	8	5.9	5.9	100.0
		-----	-----	-----	
	TOTAL	135	100.0	100.0	
Mean	2.400	Std Dev	1.223	Minimum	1.000
Maximum	5.000				

Valid Cases 135 Missing Cases 0

Q39 MTPS PROVIDED BASIS FOR TOUGH TRNG

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
STRONGLY AGREE	1	27	20.0	20.3	20.3
AGREE	2	60	44.4	45.1	65.4
NEUTRAL	3	36	26.7	27.1	92.5
DISAGREE	4	7	5.2	5.3	97.7
STRONGLY DISAGREE	5	3	2.2	2.3	100.0
	.	2	1.5	MISSING	
		-----	-----	-----	
	TOTAL	135	100.0	100.0	
Mean	2.241	Std Dev	.914	Minimum	1.000
Maximum	5.000				

Valid Cases 133 Missing Cases 2

Part II - Commanders of Combat Arms Battalions (Cont)

Q41 HIGHER HQ CHANGES HINDERED TRNG

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
ALMOST NEVER	1	10	7.4	7.5	7.5
SELDOM	2	34	25.2	25.4	32.8
SOMETIMES	3	62	45.9	46.3	79.1
FREQUENTLY	4	26	19.3	19.4	98.5
ALMOST ALWAYS	5	2	1.5	1.5	100.0
	.	1	.7	MISSING	
	TOTAL	135	100.0	100.0	
Mean	2.821	Std Dev	.883	Minimum	1.000
Maximum	5.000				

Valid Cases 134 Missing Cases 1

Q42 HIGHER HQ DIRECTIVES ENHANCED TRNG

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
STRONGLY AGREE	1	5	3.7	3.7	3.7
AGREE	2	51	37.8	37.8	41.5
NEUTRAL	3	46	34.1	34.1	75.6
DISAGREE	4	28	20.7	20.7	96.3
STRONGLY DISAGREE	5	5	3.7	3.7	100.0
	TOTAL	135	100.0	100.0	
Mean	2.830	Std Dev	.927	Minimum	1.000
Maximum	5.000				

Valid Cases 135 Missing Cases 0

Part II - Commanders of Combat Arms Battalions (Cont)

Q43 TRNG INCLUDED COMBINED ARMS AND SLICE

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
ALMOST NEVER	1	4	3.0	3.0	3.0
SELDOM	2	9	6.7	6.7	9.7
SOMETIMES	3	20	14.8	14.9	24.6
FREQUENTLY	4	52	38.5	38.8	63.4
ALMOST ALWAYS	5	49	36.3	36.6	100.0
	.	1	.7	MISSING	
	TOTAL	135	100.0	100.0	
Mean	3.993	Std Dev	1.030	Minimum	1.000
Maximum	5.000				

Valid Cases 134 Missing Cases 1

Q44 TRNG WAS JOINT

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
ALMOST NEVER	1	29	21.5	21.5	21.5
SELDOM	2	32	23.7	23.7	45.2
SOMETIMES	3	39	28.9	28.9	74.1
FREQUENTLY	4	30	22.2	22.2	96.3
ALMOST ALWAYS	5	4	3.0	3.0	99.3
	6	1	.7	.7	100.0
	TOTAL	135	100.0	100.0	
Mean	2.637	Std Dev	1.176	Minimum	1.000
Maximum	6.000				

Valid Cases 135 Missing Cases 0

Part II - Commanders of Combat Arms Battalions (Cont)

Q45 NCOS ABILITY TO PLAN AND CONDUCT TRNG

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
STRONGLY AGREE	1	36	26.7	26.9	26.9
AGREE	2	63	46.7	47.0	73.9
NEUTRAL	3	13	9.6	9.7	83.6
DISAGREE	4	17	12.6	12.7	96.3
STRONGLY DISAGREE	5	5	3.7	3.7	100.0
	.	1	.7	MISSING	
		-----	-----	-----	
	TOTAL	135	100.0	100.0	
Mean	2.194	Std Dev	1.086	Minimum	1.000
Maximum	5.000				

Valid Cases 134 Missing Cases 1

Q46 OK TO TRNSFR INDIV TRNG FROM AIT TO UNIT

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
STRONGLY AGREE	1	9	6.7	6.7	6.7
AGREE	2	28	20.7	20.9	27.6
NEUTRAL	3	19	14.1	14.2	41.8
DISAGREE	4	49	36.3	36.6	78.4
STRONGLY DISAGREE	5	29	21.5	21.6	100.0
	.	1	.7	MISSING	
		-----	-----	-----	
	TOTAL	135	100.0	100.0	
Mean	3.455	Std Dev	1.230	Minimum	1.000
Maximum	5.000				

Valid Cases 134 Missing Cases 1

Part II - Commanders of Combat Arms Battalions (Cont)

Q47 BNCOC/ANCOC IMPROVED CAPABILITY TO TRN

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
STRONGLY AGREE	1	40	29.6	29.9	29.9
AGREE	2	75	55.6	56.0	85.8
NEUTRAL	3	13	9.6	9.7	95.5
DISAGREE	4	5	3.7	3.7	99.3
STRONGLY DISAGREE	5	1	.7	.7	100.0
	.	1	.7	MISSING	
		-----	-----	-----	
	TOTAL	135	100.0	100.0	
Mean	1.896	Std Dev	.778	Minimum	1.000
Maximum	5.000				

Valid Cases 134 Missing Cases 1

Q48 JR OFF ABLE TO PLAN, CONDUCT TRNG

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
STRONGLY AGREE	1	21	15.6	15.7	15.7
AGREE	2	83	61.5	61.9	77.6
NEUTRAL	3	14	10.4	10.4	88.1
DISAGREE	4	14	10.4	10.4	98.5
STRONGLY DISAGREE	5	2	1.5	1.5	100.0
	.	1	.7	MISSING	
		-----	-----	-----	
	TOTAL	135	100.0	100.0	
Mean	2.201	Std Dev	.882	Minimum	1.000
Maximum	5.000				

Valid Cases 134 Missing Cases 1

Part II - Commanders of Combat Arms Battalions (Cont)

Q49 SCENARIOS AT CTC SUPPORTED ALB

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
STRONGLY AGREE	1	60	44.4	45.1	45.1
AGREE	2	55	40.7	41.4	86.5
NEUTRAL	3	15	11.1	11.3	97.7
DISAGREE	4	2	1.5	1.5	99.2
STRONGLY DISAGREE	5	1	.7	.8	100.0
	.	2	1.5	MISSING	
		-----	-----	-----	
	TOTAL	135	100.0	100.0	
Mean	1.714	Std Dev	.784	Minimum	1.000
Maximum	5.000				

Valid Cases 133 Missing Cases 2

Q50 CTC PERFORMANCE ON OER

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
YES, EXPLICITLY	1	57	42.2	45.2	45.2
YES, IMPLICITLY	2	23	17.0	18.3	63.5
NO	3	23	17.0	18.3	81.7
DONT KNOW	4	21	15.6	16.7	98.4
	5	2	1.5	1.6	100.0
	.	9	6.7	MISSING	
		-----	-----	-----	
	TOTAL	135	100.0	100.0	
Mean	2.111	Std Dev	1.201	Minimum	1.000
Maximum	5.000				

Valid Cases 126 Missing Cases 9

Part II - Commanders of Combat Arms Battalions (Cont)

Q51 NUMBER OF CTC ROTATIONS

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
NONE	1	44	32.6	32.8	32.8
1	2	33	24.4	24.6	57.5
2	3	24	17.8	17.9	75.4
3	4	16	11.9	11.9	87.3
4 OR MORE	5	12	8.9	9.0	96.3
NA	6	5	3.7	3.7	100.0
	.	1	.7	MISSING	
	TOTAL	135	100.0	100.0	
Mean	2.507	Std Dev	1.465	Minimum	1.000
Maximum	6.000				

Valid Cases 134 Missing Cases 1

Q52 FREQUENCY OF QTBS

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
NEVER	1	7	5.2	5.2	5.2
ANNUALLY	2	4	3.0	3.0	8.1
SEMI-ANNUALLY	3	8	5.9	5.9	14.1
QUARTERLY	4	110	81.5	81.5	95.6
MORE THAN QUARTERLY	5	6	4.4	4.4	100.0
	TOTAL	135	100.0	100.0	
Mean	3.770	Std Dev	.801	Minimum	1.000
Maximum	5.000				

Valid Cases 135 Missing Cases 0



Part II - Commanders of Combat Arms Battalions

Q53            ATTAIN STDS FOR INDIV MARKSMENSHIP

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
SELDOM	2	6	4.4	4.4	4.4
SOMETIMES	3	8	5.9	5.9	10.4
FREQUENTLY	4	23	17.0	17.0	27.4
ALMOST ALWAYS	5	98	72.6	72.6	100.0
		-----	-----	-----	
	TOTAL	135	100.0	100.0	
Mean	4.578	Std Dev	.796	Minimum	2.000
Maximum	5.000				
Valid Cases	135	Missing Cases	0		

Q54            FREQUENCY OF PT PER WEEK

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
\$3 PER WEEK	1	2	1.5	1.5	1.5
3 PER WEEK	2	39	28.9	29.1	30.6
4 PER WEEK	3	18	13.3	13.4	44.0
5 PER WEEK	4	59	43.7	44.0	88.1
	5	16	11.9	11.9	100.0
	.	1	.7	MISSING	
		-----	-----	-----	
	TOTAL	135	100.0	100.0	
Mean	3.358	Std Dev	1.072	Minimum	1.000
Maximum	5.000				
Valid Cases	134	Missing Cases	1		

Part II - Commanders of Combat Arms Battalions (Cont)

Q55 LENGTH OF GARRISON DUTY DAY

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
\$8 HOURS	1	11	8.1	8.2	8.2
8-9 HOURS	2	47	34.8	35.1	43.3
10-11 HOURS	3	70	51.9	52.2	95.5
12 HOURS	4	5	3.7	3.7	99.3
¶12 HOURS	5	1	.7	.7	100.0
	.	1	.7	MISSING	
		-----	-----	-----	
	TOTAL	135	100.0	100.0	

Mean 2.537 Std Dev .732 Minimum 1.000  
Maximum 5.000

Valid Cases 134 Missing Cases 1

Q56 OFF PROF DEV PROGRAM

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
YES	1	126	93.3	94.0	94.0
NO	2	7	5.2	5.2	99.3
	4	1	.7	.7	100.0
	.	1	.7	MISSING	
		-----	-----	-----	
	TOTAL	135	100.0	100.0	

Mean 1.075 Std Dev .339 Minimum 1.000  
Maximum 4.000

Valid Cases 134 Missing Cases 1

Part II - Commanders of Combat Arms Battalions (Cont)

Q57 HAD SUFFICIENT TRNG DAYS

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
STRONGLY AGREE	1	27	20.0	20.0	20.0
AGREE	2	71	52.6	52.6	72.6
NEUTRAL	3	7	5.2	5.2	77.8
DISAGREE	4	27	20.0	20.0	97.8
STRONGLY DISAGREE	5	3	2.2	2.2	100.0
		-----	-----	-----	
	TOTAL	135	100.0	100.0	
Mean	2.319	Std Dev	1.077	Minimum	1.000
Maximum	5.000				

Valid Cases 135 Missing Cases 0

Q58 NEW SOLDIERS HAD BASIC SOLDIER SKILLS

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
STRONGLY AGREE	1	7	5.2	5.2	5.2
AGREE	2	68	50.4	50.4	55.6
NEUTRAL	3	21	15.6	15.6	71.1
DISAGREE	4	34	25.2	25.2	96.3
STRONGLY DISAGREE	5	5	3.7	3.7	100.0
		-----	-----	-----	
	TOTAL	135	100.0	100.0	
Mean	2.719	Std Dev	1.020	Minimum	1.000
Maximum	5.000				

Valid Cases 135 Missing Cases 0

Part II - Commanders of Combat Arms Battalions (Cont)

Q59 NEW SOLDIERS HAD BASIC MOS SKILLS

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
STRONGLY AGREE	1	6	4.4	4.4	4.4
AGREE	2	45	33.3	33.3	37.8
NEUTRAL	3	22	16.3	16.3	54.1
DISAGREE	4	60	44.4	44.4	98.5
STRONGLY DISAGREE	5	2	1.5	1.5	100.0
		-----	-----	-----	
	TOTAL	135	100.0	100.0	
Mean	3.052	Std Dev	1.010	Minimum	1.000
Maximum	5.000				

Valid Cases 135 Missing Cases 0

Q60 NCOS KNOW AND ABIL TO TRAIN

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
STRONGLY AGREE	1	18	13.3	13.3	13.3
AGREE	2	75	55.6	55.6	68.9
NEUTRAL	3	18	13.3	13.3	82.2
DISAGREE	4	18	13.3	13.3	95.6
STRONGLY DISAGREE	5	6	4.4	4.4	100.0
		-----	-----	-----	
	TOTAL	135	100.0	100.0	
Mean	2.400	Std Dev	1.024	Minimum	1.000
Maximum	5.000				

Valid Cases 135 Missing Cases 0

Part II - Commanders of Combat Arms Battalions (Cont)

Q61 JR OFF SKILL AND KNOW TO TRAIN

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
STRONGLY AGREE	1	9	6.7	6.7	6.7
AGREE	2	86	63.7	63.7	70.4
NEUTRAL	3	18	13.3	13.3	83.7
DISAGREE	4	19	14.1	14.1	97.8
STRONGLY DISAGREE	5	3	2.2	2.2	100.0
		-----	-----	-----	
	TOTAL	135	100.0	100.0	
Mean	2.415	Std Dev	.893	Minimum	1.000
Maximum	5.000				

Valid Cases 135 Missing Cases 0

Q62 JR OFF GROUNDED IN UNIT DOCTRINE

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
STRONGLY AGREE	1	3	2.2	2.2	2.2
AGREE	2	74	54.8	54.8	57.0
NEUTRAL	3	22	16.3	16.3	73.3
DISAGREE	4	33	24.4	24.4	97.8
STRONGLY DISAGREE	5	3	2.2	2.2	100.0
		-----	-----	-----	
	TOTAL	135	100.0	100.0	
Mean	2.696	Std Dev	.941	Minimum	1.000
Maximum	5.000				

Valid Cases 135 Missing Cases 0

Part II - Commanders of Combat Arms Battalions (Cont)

Q63 LEAVENWORTH PCC ADEQUATE

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
STRONGLY AGREE	1	5	3.7	3.7	3.7
AGREE	2	77	57.0	57.5	61.2
NEUTRAL	3	37	27.4	27.6	88.8
DISAGREE	4	11	8.1	8.2	97.0
STRONGLY DISAGREE	5	4	3.0	3.0	100.0
	.	1	.7	MISSING	
		-----	-----	-----	
	TOTAL	135	100.0	100.0	
Mean	2.493	Std Dev	.820	Minimum	1.000
Maximum	5.000				

Valid Cases 134 Missing Cases 1

Q64 BRANCH PCC ADEQUATE

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
STRONGLY AGREE	1	5	3.7	3.8	3.8
AGREE	2	72	53.3	54.1	57.9
NEUTRAL	3	36	26.7	27.1	85.0
DISAGREE	4	15	11.1	11.3	96.2
STRONGLY DISAGREE	5	5	3.7	3.8	100.0
	.	2	1.5	MISSING	
		-----	-----	-----	
	TOTAL	135	100.0	100.0	
Mean	2.571	Std Dev	.882	Minimum	1.000
Maximum	5.000				

Valid Cases 133 Missing Cases 2

Part II - Commanders of Combat Arms Battalions (Cont)

Q65 JR SOLDIERS BETTER EDUCATED THAN NCOS

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
STRONGLY AGREE	1	3	2.2	2.2	2.2
AGREE	2	45	33.3	33.3	35.6
NEUTRAL	3	35	25.9	25.9	61.5
DISAGREE	4	50	37.0	37.0	98.5
STRONGLY DISAGREE	5	2	1.5	1.5	100.0
		-----	-----	-----	
	TOTAL	135	100.0	100.0	
Mean	3.022	Std Dev	.926	Minimum	1.000
Maximum	5.000				
Valid Cases	135	Missing Cases	0		

Q66 OFF UNDERSTOOD ORG STRUC AND RELTN

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
STRONGLY AGREE	1	7	5.2	5.2	5.2
AGREE	2	96	71.1	71.6	76.9
NEUTRAL	3	19	14.1	14.2	91.0
DISAGREE	4	12	8.9	9.0	100.0
.	.	1	.7	MISSING	
		-----	-----	-----	
	TOTAL	135	100.0	100.0	
Mean	2.269	Std Dev	.695	Minimum	1.000
Maximum	4.000				
Valid Cases	134	Missing Cases	1		

Part II - Commanders of Combat Arms Battalions (Cont)

Q67 POST COMMAND CLIMATE SATISFACTORY

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
STRONGLY AGREE	1	63	46.7	46.7	46.7
AGREE	2	49	36.3	36.3	83.0
NEUTRAL	3	10	7.4	7.4	90.4
DISAGREE	4	8	5.9	5.9	96.3
STRONGLY DISAGREE	5	5	3.7	3.7	100.0
		-----	-----	-----	
	TOTAL	135	100.0	100.0	
Mean	1.837	Std Dev	1.045	Minimum	1.000
Maximum	5.000				
Valid Cases	135	Missing Cases	0		

Q68 CHAIN OF COMMAND VALUES MATCHED YOURS

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
STRONGLY AGREE	1	42	31.1	31.1	31.1
AGREE	2	68	50.4	50.4	81.5
NEUTRAL	3	11	8.1	8.1	89.6
DISAGREE	4	9	6.7	6.7	96.3
STRONGLY DISAGREE	5	5	3.7	3.7	100.0
		-----	-----	-----	
	TOTAL	135	100.0	100.0	
Mean	2.015	Std Dev	1.000	Minimum	1.000
Maximum	5.000				
Valid Cases	135	Missing Cases	0		



Part II - Commanders of Combat Arms Battalions (Cont)

Q69 COC SUPPORTED ACCURATE REPORTING

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
STRONGLY AGREE	1	70	51.9	51.9	51.9
AGREE	2	48	35.6	35.6	87.4
NEUTRAL	3	7	5.2	5.2	92.6
DISAGREE	4	6	4.4	4.4	97.0
STRONGLY DISAGREE	5	4	3.0	3.0	100.0
TOTAL		135	100.0	100.0	

Mean 1.711 Std Dev .969 Minimum 1.000  
Maximum 5.000

Valid Cases 135 Missing Cases 0

Q70 ACCURATE ASSESSMENTS AND REPORTS UP

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
STRONGLY AGREE	1	39	28.9	28.9	28.9
AGREE	2	88	65.2	65.2	94.1
NEUTRAL	3	5	3.7	3.7	97.8
DISAGREE	4	3	2.2	2.2	100.0
TOTAL		135	100.0	100.0	

Mean 1.793 Std Dev .612 Minimum 1.000  
Maximum 4.000

Valid Cases 135 Missing Cases 0

Q71 NCO MORAL AND ETHICAL STDS SAT

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
STRONGLY AGREE	1	16	11.9	11.9	11.9
AGREE	2	95	70.4	70.4	82.2
NEUTRAL	3	17	12.6	12.6	94.8
DISAGREE	4	7	5.2	5.2	100.0
TOTAL		135	100.0	100.0	

Mean 2.111 Std Dev .665 Minimum 1.000  
Maximum 4.000

Valid Cases 135 Missing Cases 0

Part II - Commanders of Combat Arms Battalions (Cont)

Q72 OFF MORAL AND ETHICAL STDS SAT

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
STRONGLY AGREE	1	27	20.0	20.0	20.0
AGREE	2	100	74.1	74.1	94.1
NEUTRAL	3	4	3.0	3.0	97.0
DISAGREE	4	3	2.2	2.2	99.3
STRONGLY DISAGREE	5	1	.7	.7	100.0
		-----	-----	-----	
	TOTAL	135	100.0	100.0	
Mean	1.896	Std Dev	.614	Minimum	1.000
Maximum	5.000				

Valid Cases 135 Missing Cases 0

Q73 DRUG/ALCOHOL PROBLEM FOR JR EM

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
STRONGLY AGREE	1	2	1.5	1.5	1.5
AGREE	2	23	17.0	17.0	18.5
NEUTRAL	3	12	8.9	8.9	27.4
DISAGREE	4	77	57.0	57.0	84.4
STRONGLY DISAGREE	5	21	15.6	15.6	100.0
		-----	-----	-----	
	TOTAL	135	100.0	100.0	
Mean	3.681	Std Dev	.982	Minimum	1.000
Maximum	5.000				

Valid Cases 135 Missing Cases 0

Part II - Commanders of Combat Arms Battalions (Cont)

Q74 DRUG/ALCOHOL PROBLEM FOR NCOS

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
AGREE	2	20	14.8	14.8	14.8
NEUTRAL	3	15	11.1	11.1	25.9
DISAGREE	4	76	56.3	56.3	82.2
STRONGLY DISAGREE	5	24	17.8	17.8	100.0
		-----	-----	-----	
	TOTAL	135	100.0	100.0	
Mean	3.770	Std Dev	.914	Minimum	2.000
Maximum	5.000				

Valid Cases 135 Missing Cases 0

Q75 DRUG/ALCOHOL PROBLEM FOR OFF

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
STRONGLY AGREE	1	1	.7	.7	.7
AGREE	2	4	3.0	3.0	3.7
NEUTRAL	3	5	3.7	3.7	7.5
DISAGREE	4	64	47.4	47.8	55.2
STRONGLY DISAGREE	5	60	44.4	44.8	100.0
	.	1	.7	MISSING	
		-----	-----	-----	
	TOTAL	135	100.0	100.0	
Mean	4.328	Std Dev	.754	Minimum	1.000
Maximum	5.000				

Valid Cases 134 Missing Cases 1

Part II - Commanders of Combat Arms Battalions (Cont)

Q79 UCMJ ACTIONS PER MONTH

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
0-5	1	95	70.4	81.2	81.2
6-10	2	18	13.3	15.4	96.6
11-15	3	2	1.5	1.7	98.3
¶15	4	1	.7	.9	99.1
	5	1	.7	.9	100.0
	.	18	13.3	MISSING	
		-----	-----	-----	
	TOTAL	135	100.0	100.0	
Mean	1.248	Std Dev	.615	Minimum	1.000
Maximum	5.000				

Valid Cases 117 Missing Cases 18

Q81 FREQ MENTORED BY CDR

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
DAILY	1	4	3.0	3.0	3.0
WEEKLY	2	25	18.5	18.9	22.0
MONTHLY	3	29	21.5	22.0	43.9
QUARTERLY	4	23	17.0	17.4	61.4
ANNUALLY	5	10	7.4	7.6	68.9
AT OER TIME	6	21	15.6	15.9	84.8
NEVER	7	20	14.8	15.2	100.0
	.	3	2.2	MISSING	
		-----	-----	-----	
	TOTAL	135	100.0	100.0	
Mean	4.159	Std Dev	1.824	Minimum	1.000
Maximum	7.000				

Valid Cases 132 Missing Cases 3

Part II - Commanders of Combat Arms Battalions (Cont)

Q82           FREQ COUNSELED SUBORDINATES

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
DAILY	1	18	13.3	13.3	13.3
WEEKLY	2	27	20.0	20.0	33.3
MONTHLY	3	41	30.4	30.4	63.7
QUARTERLY	4	45	33.3	33.3	97.0
ANNUALLY	5	1	.7	.7	97.8
AT OER TIME	6	3	2.2	2.2	100.0
		-----	-----	-----	
	TOTAL	135	100.0	100.0	
Mean	2.948	Std Dev	1.142	Minimum	1.000
Maximum	6.000				

Valid Cases       135       Missing Cases       0

Q83           FREQ POSITIVE WRITTEN COUNSELING

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
DAILY	1	2	1.5	1.5	1.5
WEEKLY	2	4	3.0	3.0	4.4
MONTHLY	3	20	14.8	14.8	19.3
QUARTERLY	4	44	32.6	32.6	51.9
ANNUALLY	5	11	8.1	8.1	60.0
AT OER TIME	6	33	24.4	24.4	84.4
NEVER	7	21	15.6	15.6	100.0
		-----	-----	-----	
	TOTAL	135	100.0	100.0	
Mean	4.785	Std Dev	1.503	Minimum	1.000
Maximum	7.000				

Valid Cases       135       Missing Cases       0

Part II - Commanders of Combat Arms Battalions (Cont)

Q84 YOUR FREEDOM TO COMMAND

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
LOW	1	3	2.2	2.2	2.2
MODERATE	2	18	13.3	13.4	15.7
HIGH	3	112	83.0	83.6	99.3
	6	1	.7	.7	100.0
	.	1	.7	MISSING	
		-----	-----	-----	
	TOTAL	135	100.0	100.0	
Mean	2.843	Std Dev	.518	Minimum	1.000
Maximum	6.000				
Valid Cases	134	Missing Cases	1		

Q85 YOUR SUBORDINATES FREEDOM TO CMD

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
MODERATE	2	41	30.4	30.4	30.4
HIGH	3	93	68.9	68.9	99.3
	5	1	.7	.7	100.0
		-----	-----	-----	
	TOTAL	135	100.0	100.0	
Mean	2.711	Std Dev	.502	Minimum	2.000
Maximum	5.000				
Valid Cases	135	Missing Cases	0		

Q86 IMPORTANCE OF STATISTICS

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
NO IMPORTANCE	1	10	7.4	7.4	7.4
NOT ENOUGH	2	2	1.5	1.5	8.9
ABOUT RIGHT	3	94	69.6	69.6	78.5
A LITTLE TOO MUCH	4	23	17.0	17.0	95.6
ENTIRELY TOO MUCH	5	6	4.4	4.4	100.0
		-----	-----	-----	
	TOTAL	135	100.0	100.0	
Mean	3.096	Std Dev	.809	Minimum	1.000
Maximum	5.000				
Valid Cases	135	Missing Cases	0		

Part II - Commanders of Combat Arms Battalions (Cont)

Q87 YOUR SENIOR RATER PROFILE KNOWN

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
YES	1	123	91.1	91.1	91.1
NO	2	11	8.1	8.1	99.3
	5	1	.7	.7	100.0
		-----	-----	-----	
	TOTAL	135	100.0	100.0	
Mean	1.111	Std Dev	.435	Minimum	1.000
Maximum	5.000				
Valid Cases	135	Missing Cases	0		

Q88 DISCUSS RATINGS WITH SUBORDINATES

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
YES	1	128	94.8	94.8	94.8
NO	2	7	5.2	5.2	100.0
		-----	-----	-----	
	TOTAL	135	100.0	100.0	
Mean	1.052	Std Dev	.223	Minimum	1.000
Maximum	2.000				
Valid Cases	135	Missing Cases	0		

Q89 YOUR SENIOR RATER'S PROFILE KNOWN

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
YES	1	52	38.5	39.7	39.7
NO	2	79	58.5	60.3	100.0
	.	4	3.0	MISSING	
		-----	-----	-----	
	TOTAL	135	100.0	100.0	
Mean	1.603	Std Dev	.491	Minimum	1.000
Maximum	2.000				
Valid Cases	131	Missing Cases	4		

Part II - Commanders of Combat Arms Battalions (Cont)

Q90 RATER DISCUSSED YOUR REPORT PRIOR

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
YES	1	97	71.9	74.6	74.6
NO	2	33	24.4	25.4	100.0
	.	5	3.7	MISSING	
		-----	-----	-----	
	TOTAL	135	100.0	100.0	
Mean	1.254	Std Dev	.437	Minimum	1.000
Maximum	2.000				
Valid Cases	130	Missing Cases	5		

Q91 SR RTR DISCUSSED YOUR REPORT PRIOR

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
YES	1	23	17.0	17.6	17.6
NO	2	106	78.5	80.9	98.5
	3	1	.7	.8	99.2
	5	1	.7	.8	100.0
	.	4	3.0	MISSING	
		-----	-----	-----	
	TOTAL	135	100.0	100.0	
Mean	1.855	Std Dev	.482	Minimum	1.000
Maximum	5.000				
Valid Cases	131	Missing Cases	4		

Q92 SUPPORT FROM HIGHER HEADQUARTERS

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
VERY DISSATISFIED	1	5	3.7	3.7	3.7
DISSATISFIED	2	9	6.7	6.7	10.4
BORDERLINE	3	25	18.5	18.5	28.9
SATISFIED	4	59	43.7	43.7	72.6
VERY SATISFIED	5	37	27.4	27.4	100.0
		-----	-----	-----	
	TOTAL	135	100.0	100.0	
Mean	3.844	Std Dev	1.021	Minimum	1.000
Maximum	5.000				
Valid Cases	135	Missing Cases	0		



Part II - Commanders of Combat Arms Battalions (Cont)

Q93 HIGHER CDRS KNEW YOUR UNIT STATUS

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
VERY DISSATISFIED	1	6	4.4	4.4	4.4
DISSATISFIED	2	13	9.6	9.6	14.1
BORDERLINE	3	15	11.1	11.1	25.2
SATISFIED	4	62	45.9	45.9	71.1
VERY SATISFIED	5	39	28.9	28.9	100.0
		-----	-----	-----	
	TOTAL	135	100.0	100.0	
Mean	3.852	Std Dev	1.083	Minimum	1.000
Maximum	5.000				

Valid Cases 135 Missing Cases 0

Q94 FREQ OF IMMEDIATE CDR VISITS

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
NEVER	1	3	2.2	2.2	2.2
WEEKLY	2	54	40.0	40.3	42.5
MONTHLY	3	45	33.3	33.6	76.1
QUARTERLY	4	23	17.0	17.2	93.3
SEMI-ANNUALLY	5	6	4.4	4.5	97.8
ANNUALLY	6	1	.7	.7	98.5
LESS THAN ANNUALLY	7	2	1.5	1.5	100.0
	.	1	.7	MISSING	
		-----	-----	-----	
	TOTAL	135	100.0	100.0	
Mean	2.896	Std Dev	1.071	Minimum	1.000
Maximum	7.000				

Valid Cases 134 Missing Cases 1

Part II - Commanders of Combat Arms Battalions (Cont)

Q95 SENIOR CDRS WOULD SPT IN HARD TIMES

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
STRONGLY AGREE	1	52	38.5	38.5	38.5
AGREE	2	51	37.8	37.8	76.3
NEUTRAL	3	13	9.6	9.6	85.9
DISAGREE	4	13	9.6	9.6	95.6
STRONGLY DISAGREE	5	6	4.4	4.4	100.0
		-----	-----	-----	
	TOTAL	135	100.0	100.0	
Mean	2.037	Std Dev	1.129	Minimum	1.000
Maximum	5.000				

Valid Cases 135 Missing Cases 0

Q96 SAT CMD CLIMATE FROM HIGHER HQ

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
STRONGLY AGREE	1	50	37.0	37.0	37.0
AGREE	2	47	34.8	34.8	71.9
NEUTRAL	3	17	12.6	12.6	84.4
DISAGREE	4	12	8.9	8.9	93.3
STRONGLY DISAGREE	5	9	6.7	6.7	100.0
		-----	-----	-----	
	TOTAL	135	100.0	100.0	
Mean	2.133	Std Dev	1.202	Minimum	1.000
Maximum	5.000				

Valid Cases 135 Missing Cases 0

Part II - Commanders of Combat Arms Battalions (Cont)

Q97 CHAIN OF CMD FAIR TO COMMANDERS

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
YES	1	118	87.4	87.4	87.4
NO	2	13	9.6	9.6	97.0
	4	3	2.2	2.2	99.3
	5	1	.7	.7	100.0
		-----	-----	-----	
	TOTAL	135	100.0	100.0	
Mean	1.193	Std Dev	.617	Minimum	1.000
Maximum	5.000				

Valid Cases 135 Missing Cases 0

Q98 HOW POSITIVE ABOUT ARMY CAREER

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
MUCH MORE POSITIVELY	1	33	24.4	24.4	24.4
MORE POSITIVELY	2	39	28.9	28.9	53.3
ABOUT THE SAME	3	42	31.1	31.1	84.4
LESS POSITIVELY	4	17	12.6	12.6	97.0
MUCH LESS POSITIVELY	5	4	3.0	3.0	100.0
		-----	-----	-----	
	TOTAL	135	100.0	100.0	
Mean	2.407	Std Dev	1.081	Minimum	1.000
Maximum	5.000				

Valid Cases 135 Missing Cases 0

# Part III - Results for Commanders of Combat Support Battalions

## Q11 ACCOMPANIED TOUR

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
YES WITH SPOUSE	1	42	93.3	93.3	93.3
N/A	4	3	6.7	6.7	100.0
		-----	-----	-----	
	TOTAL	45	100.0	100.0	
Mean	1.200	Std Dev	.757	Minimum	1.000
Maximum	4.000				
Valid Cases	45	Missing Cases	0		

## Q12 LIVED ON POST

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
YES	1	34	75.6	75.6	75.6
NO	2	11	24.4	24.4	100.0
		-----	-----	-----	
	TOTAL	45	100.0	100.0	
Mean	1.244	Std Dev	.435	Minimum	1.000
Maximum	2.000				
Valid Cases	45	Missing Cases	0		

## Q13 SPOUSE PARTICIPATION

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
SELDOM	2	3	6.7	7.1	7.1
SOMETIMES	3	7	15.6	16.7	23.8
FREQUENTLY	4	7	15.6	16.7	40.5
ALMOST ALWAYS	5	25	55.6	59.5	100.0
.	.	3	6.7	MISSING	
		-----	-----	-----	
	TOTAL	45	100.0	100.0	
Mean	4.286	Std Dev	.995	Minimum	2.000
Maximum	5.000				
Valid Cases	42	Missing Cases	3		

Part III - Commanders of CS Units (Cont)

Q14 SPOUSE EMPLOYMENT

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
FULL TIME	1	8	17.8	19.0	19.0
PART TIME	2	12	26.7	28.6	47.6
NOT OUTSIDE HOME	3	22	48.9	52.4	100.0
.	.	3	6.7	MISSING	
		-----	-----	-----	
	TOTAL	45	100.0	100.0	
Mean	2.333	Std Dev	.786	Minimum	1.000
Maximum	3.000				
Valid Cases	42	Missing Cases	3		

Q15 DIRECT INPUT IN DEVELOPING COB

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
YES	1	35	77.8	77.8	77.8
SOMETIMES	2	6	13.3	13.3	91.1
NO	3	4	8.9	8.9	100.0
		-----	-----	-----	
	TOTAL	45	100.0	100.0	
Mean	1.311	Std Dev	.633	Minimum	1.000
Maximum	3.000				
Valid Cases	45	Missing Cases	0		

Q16 PERCENT TIME ON BUDGET MANAGEMENT

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
\$10%	1	32	71.1	71.1	71.1
11-20%	2	11	24.4	24.4	95.6
21-30%	3	2	4.4	4.4	100.0
		-----	-----	-----	
	TOTAL	45	100.0	100.0	
Mean	1.333	Std Dev	.564	Minimum	1.000
Maximum	3.000				
Valid Cases	45	Missing Cases	0		

Part III - Commanders of CS Units (Cont)

Q17 ENOUGH AMMUNITION FOR STRAC

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
YES	1	24	53.3	53.3	53.3
NO	2	16	35.6	35.6	88.9
NA	3	5	11.1	11.1	100.0
		-----	-----	-----	
TOTAL		45	100.0	100.0	

Mean 1.578 Std Dev .690 Minimum 1.000  
Maximum 3.000

Valid Cases 45 Missing Cases 0

Q18 SUFFICIENT TRAINING FUNDS

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
SELDOM	2	2	4.4	4.4	4.4
SOMETIMES	3	5	11.1	11.1	15.6
FREQUENTLY	4	12	26.7	26.7	42.2
ALMOST ALWAYS	5	26	57.8	57.8	100.0
		-----	-----	-----	
TOTAL		45	100.0	100.0	

Mean 4.378 Std Dev .860 Minimum 2.000  
Maximum 5.000

Valid Cases 45 Missing Cases 0

Q19 AVERAGE PERSONNEL TURNOVER RATE

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
\$10%	1	17	37.8	37.8	37.8
11-15%	2	20	44.4	44.4	82.2
16-20%	3	5	11.1	11.1	93.3
21-25%	4	1	2.2	2.2	95.6
26-30%	5	2	4.4	4.4	100.0
		-----	-----	-----	
TOTAL		45	100.0	100.0	

Mean 1.911 Std Dev .996 Minimum 1.000  
Maximum 5.000

Valid Cases 45 Missing Cases 0

Part III - Commanders of CS Units (Cont)

Q20 AVAILABILITY OF TRAINING RESOURCES

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
SELDOM	2	1	2.2	2.2	2.2
SOMETIMES	3	10	22.2	22.2	24.4
FREQUENTLY	4	20	44.4	44.4	68.9
ALMOST ALWAYS	5	14	31.1	31.1	100.0
		-----	-----	-----	
	TOTAL	45	100.0	100.0	
Mean	4.044	Std Dev	.796	Minimum	2.000
Maximum	5.000				
Valid Cases	45	Missing Cases	0		

Q21 UFRS INHIBITED TRAINING

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
ALMOST NEVER	1	15	33.3	33.3	33.3
SELDOM	2	15	33.3	33.3	66.7
SOMETIMES	3	11	24.4	24.4	91.1
FREQUENTLY	4	3	6.7	6.7	97.8
ALMOST ALWAYS	5	1	2.2	2.2	100.0
		-----	-----	-----	
	TOTAL	45	100.0	100.0	
Mean	2.111	Std Dev	1.027	Minimum	1.000
Maximum	5.000				
Valid Cases	45	Missing Cases	0		

Q22 ALO

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
1	1	23	51.1	51.1	51.1
2	2	12	26.7	26.7	77.8
3	3	6	13.3	13.3	91.1
NA	4	4	8.9	8.9	100.0
		-----	-----	-----	
	TOTAL	45	100.0	100.0	
Mean	1.800	Std Dev	.991	Minimum	1.000
Maximum	4.000				
Valid Cases	45	Missing Cases	0		

Part III - Commanders of CS Battalions (Cont)

Q23 CRITICAL RESOURCES SHARED

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
DONT KNOW	1	1	2.2	2.2	2.2
NOT AT ALL	2	8	17.8	17.8	20.0
SLIGHTLY	3	15	33.3	33.3	53.3
MODERATELY	4	16	35.6	35.6	88.9
GREATLY	5	5	11.1	11.1	100.0
		-----	-----	-----	
	TOTAL	45	100.0	100.0	
Mean	3.356	Std Dev	.981	Minimum	1.000
Maximum	5.000				

Valid Cases 45 Missing Cases 0

Q24 CRITICAL RESOURCES CROSSLEVELED

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
DONT KNOW	1	1	2.2	2.3	2.3
NOT AT ALL	2	5	11.1	11.4	13.6
SLIGHTLY	3	19	42.2	43.2	56.8
MODERATELY	4	15	33.3	34.1	90.9
GREATLY	5	4	8.9	9.1	100.0
	.	1	2.2	MISSING	
		-----	-----	-----	
	TOTAL	45	100.0	100.0	
Mean	3.364	Std Dev	.892	Minimum	1.000
Maximum	5.000				

Valid Cases 44 Missing Cases 1



Part III - Commanders of CS Units (Cont)

Q25 OTHER UNITS WITH HIGHER PRIORITY

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
YES	1	19	42.2	44.2	44.2
NO	2	23	51.1	53.5	97.7
	5	1	2.2	2.3	100.0
	.	2	4.4	MISSING	
	TOTAL	45	100.0	100.0	
Mean	1.628	Std Dev	.725	Minimum	1.000
Maximum	5.000				
Valid Cases	43	Missing Cases	2		

Q26 FACILITY AVAIL DEGRADED TRAINING

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
DONT KNOW	1	2	4.4	4.4	4.4
NOT AT ALL	2	16	35.6	35.6	40.0
SLIGHTLY	3	18	40.0	40.0	80.0
MODERATELY	4	6	13.3	13.3	93.3
GREATLY	5	3	6.7	6.7	100.0
	TOTAL	45	100.0	100.0	
Mean	2.822	Std Dev	.960	Minimum	1.000
Maximum	5.000				
Valid Cases	45	Missing Cases	0		

Q27 MOS SHORTAGES DEGRADED EFFECTIVENESS

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
NOT AT ALL	2	9	20.0	20.0	20.0
SLIGHTLY	3	19	42.2	42.2	62.2
MODERATELY	4	11	24.4	24.4	86.7
GREATLY	5	5	11.1	11.1	97.8
	7	1	2.2	2.2	100.0
	TOTAL	45	100.0	100.0	
Mean	3.356	Std Dev	1.069	Minimum	2.000
Maximum	7.000				
Valid Cases	45	Missing Cases	0		

Part III - Commanders of CS Battalions (Cont)

Q28 TOTAL COB

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
\$S1 M	1	21	46.7	47.7	47.7
\$1-5 M	2	17	37.8	38.6	86.4
\$6-10 M	3	3	6.7	6.8	93.2
¶\$10 M	4	2	4.4	4.5	97.7
	5	1	2.2	2.3	100.0
	.	1	2.2	MISSING	
		-----	-----	-----	
	TOTAL	45	100.0	100.0	
Mean	1.750	Std Dev	.943	Minimum	1.000
Maximum	5.000				

Valid Cases 44 Missing Cases 1

Q29 ALO CONSTRAINED READINESS

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
STRONGLY AGREE	1	1	2.2	2.3	2.3
AGREE	2	12	26.7	27.3	29.5
NEUTRAL	3	4	8.9	9.1	38.6
DISAGREE	4	13	28.9	29.5	68.2
STRONGLY DISAGREE	5	14	31.1	31.8	100.0
	.	1	2.2	MISSING	
		-----	-----	-----	
	TOTAL	45	100.0	100.0	
Mean	3.614	Std Dev	1.262	Minimum	1.000
Maximum	5.000				

Valid Cases 44 Missing Cases 1

Part III - Commanders of CS Units (Cont)

Q30 REPAIR PARTS REQUISITIONS DEFERRED

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
ALMOST NEVER	1	30	66.7	68.2	68.2
SELDOM	2	5	11.1	11.4	79.5
SOMETIMES	3	8	17.8	18.2	97.7
ALMOST ALWAYS	5	1	2.2	2.3	100.0
.	.	1	2.2	MISSING	
TOTAL		45	100.0	100.0	
Mean	1.568	Std Dev	.950	Minimum	1.000
Maximum	5.000				

Valid Cases 44 Missing Cases 1

Q31 BASIS FOR BUDGET

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
PROJECTED EVENTS	1	26	57.8	59.1	59.1
PRIOR EXPENDITURES	2	11	24.4	25.0	84.1
OTHER	3	7	15.6	15.9	100.0
.	.	1	2.2	MISSING	
TOTAL		45	100.0	100.0	
Mean	1.568	Std Dev	.759	Minimum	1.000
Maximum	3.000				

Valid Cases 44 Missing Cases 1

Q32 SUFFICIENT RESOURCES FOR TRAINING

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
ALL I DESIRED	1	8	17.8	17.8	17.8
MOST I DESIRED	2	30	66.7	66.7	84.4
ONLY REQUIRED	3	6	13.3	13.3	97.8
LESS THAN REQUIRED	4	1	2.2	2.2	100.0
TOTAL		45	100.0	100.0	
Mean	2.000	Std Dev	.640	Minimum	1.000
Maximum	4.000				

Valid Cases 45 Missing Cases 0

Part III - Commanders of CS Battalions (Cont)

Q33 TRAINING DEVELOPMENT BASED ON 25 SERIES

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
STRONGLY AGREE	1	22	48.9	48.9	48.9
AGREE	2	20	44.4	44.4	93.3
NEUTRAL	3	2	4.4	4.4	97.8
DISAGREE	4	1	2.2	2.2	100.0
		-----	-----	-----	
TOTAL		45	100.0	100.0	

Mean 1.600 Std Dev .688 Minimum 1.000  
Maximum 4.000

Valid Cases 45 Missing Cases 0

Q34 CLEAR TRNG GUIDANCE FROM SENIOR HQ

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
STRONGLY AGREE	1	16	35.6	35.6	35.6
AGREE	2	17	37.8	37.8	73.3
NEUTRAL	3	5	11.1	11.1	84.4
DISAGREE	4	4	8.9	8.9	93.3
STRONGLY DISAGREE	5	3	6.7	6.7	100.0
		-----	-----	-----	
TOTAL		45	100.0	100.0	

Mean 2.133 Std Dev 1.198 Minimum 1.000  
Maximum 5.000

Valid Cases 45 Missing Cases 0

Q35 TRNG GUIDANCE SUPPORTED TOUGH TRNG

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
STRONGLY AGREE	1	22	48.9	48.9	48.9
AGREE	2	17	37.8	37.8	86.7
NEUTRAL	3	5	11.1	11.1	97.8
STRONGLY DISAGREE	5	1	2.2	2.2	100.0
		-----	-----	-----	
TOTAL		45	100.0	100.0	

Mean 1.689 Std Dev .848 Minimum 1.000  
Maximum 5.000

Valid Cases 45 Missing Cases 0

Part III - Commanders of CS Battalions (Cont)

Q36 SAME TRNG AREAS DEGRADED TRNG

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
STRONGLY AGREE	1	3	6.7	6.7	6.7
AGREE	2	9	20.0	20.0	26.7
NEUTRAL	3	11	24.4	24.4	51.1
DISAGREE	4	18	40.0	40.0	91.1
STRONGLY DISAGREE	5	4	8.9	8.9	100.0
		-----	-----	-----	
	TOTAL	45	100.0	100.0	
Mean	3.244	Std Dev	1.090	Minimum	1.000
Maximum	5.000				

Valid Cases 45 Missing Cases 0

Q37 FREQUENCY OF OFF POST TRNG

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
ALMOST NEVER	1	1	2.2	2.2	2.2
SELDOM	2	2	4.4	4.4	6.7
SOMETIMES	3	8	17.8	17.8	24.4
FREQUENTLY	4	24	53.3	53.3	77.8
ALMOST ALWAYS	5	10	22.2	22.2	100.0
		-----	-----	-----	
	TOTAL	45	100.0	100.0	
Mean	3.889	Std Dev	.885	Minimum	1.000
Maximum	5.000				

Valid Cases 45 Missing Cases 0

Part III - Commanders of CS Battalions (Cont)

Q38 TRNG BASED ON MTPS

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
STRONGLY AGREE	1	3	6.7	6.7	6.7
AGREE	2	10	22.2	22.2	28.9
NEUTRAL	3	10	22.2	22.2	51.1
DISAGREE	4	11	24.4	24.4	75.6
STRONGLY DISAGREE	5	11	24.4	24.4	100.0
		-----	-----	-----	
	TOTAL	45	100.0	100.0	
Mean	3.378	Std Dev	1.267	Minimum	1.000
Maximum	5.000				
Valid Cases	45	Missing Cases	0		

Q39 MTPS PROVIDED BASIS FOR TOUGH TRNG

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
STRONGLY AGREE	1	3	6.7	6.8	6.8
AGREE	2	14	31.1	31.8	38.6
NEUTRAL	3	18	40.0	40.9	79.5
DISAGREE	4	5	11.1	11.4	90.9
STRONGLY DISAGREE	5	4	8.9	9.1	100.0
.	.	1	2.2	MISSING	
		-----	-----	-----	
	TOTAL	45	100.0	100.0	
Mean	2.841	Std Dev	1.033	Minimum	1.000
Maximum	5.000				
Valid Cases	44	Missing Cases	1		

Part III - Commanders of CS Battalions (Cont)

Q41 HIGHER HQ CHANGES HINDERED TRNG

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
ALMOST NEVER	1	6	13.3	13.6	13.6
SELDOM	2	8	17.8	18.2	31.8
SOMETIMES	3	22	48.9	50.0	81.8
FREQUENTLY	4	7	15.6	15.9	97.7
ALMOST ALWAYS	5	1	2.2	2.3	100.0
	.	1	2.2	MISSING	
		-----	-----	-----	
	TOTAL	45	100.0	100.0	
Mean	2.750	Std Dev	.967	Minimum	1.000
Maximum	5.000				

Valid Cases 44 Missing Cases 1

Q42 HIGHER HQ DIRECTIVES ENHANCED TRNG

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
STRONGLY AGREE	1	5	11.1	11.1	11.1
AGREE	2	10	22.2	22.2	33.3
NEUTRAL	3	21	46.7	46.7	80.0
DISAGREE	4	7	15.6	15.6	95.6
STRONGLY DISAGREE	5	2	4.4	4.4	100.0
		-----	-----	-----	
	TOTAL	45	100.0	100.0	
Mean	2.800	Std Dev	.991	Minimum	1.000
Maximum	5.000				

Valid Cases 45 Missing Cases 0

Part III - Commanders of CS Battalions (Cont)

Q43 TRNG INCLUDED COMBINED ARMS AND SLICE

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
ALMOST NEVER	1	7	15.6	15.9	15.9
SELDOM	2	4	8.9	9.1	25.0
SOMETIMES	3	6	13.3	13.6	38.6
FREQUENTLY	4	21	46.7	47.7	86.4
ALMOST ALWAYS	5	6	13.3	13.6	100.0
	.	1	2.2	MISSING	
	TOTAL	45	100.0	100.0	
Mean	3.341	Std Dev	1.293	Minimum	1.000
Maximum	5.000				

Valid Cases 44 Missing Cases 1

Q44 TRNG WAS JOINT

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
ALMOST NEVER	1	9	20.0	20.0	20.0
SELDOM	2	9	20.0	20.0	40.0
SOMETIMES	3	10	22.2	22.2	62.2
FREQUENTLY	4	9	20.0	20.0	82.2
ALMOST ALWAYS	5	2	4.4	4.4	86.7
	6	6	13.3	13.3	100.0
	TOTAL	45	100.0	100.0	
Mean	3.089	Std Dev	1.621	Minimum	1.000
Maximum	6.000				

Valid Cases 45 Missing Cases 0



Part III -Commanders of CS Battalions (Cont)

Q45 NCOS ABILITY TO PLAN AND CONDUCT TRNG

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
STRONGLY AGREE	1	9	20.0	20.0	20.0
AGREE	2	27	60.0	60.0	80.0
NEUTRAL	3	5	11.1	11.1	91.1
DISAGREE	4	3	6.7	6.7	97.8
STRONGLY DISAGREE	5	1	2.2	2.2	100.0
		-----	-----	-----	
	TOTAL	45	100.0	100.0	
Mean	2.111	Std Dev	.885	Minimum	1.000
Maximum	5.000				
Valid Cases	45	Missing Cases	0		

Q46 OK TO TRNSFR INDIV TRNG FROM AIT TO UNIT

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
STRONGLY AGREE	1	1	2.2	2.2	2.2
AGREE	2	12	26.7	26.7	28.9
NEUTRAL	3	7	15.6	15.6	44.4
DISAGREE	4	15	33.3	33.3	77.8
STRONGLY DISAGREE	5	10	22.2	22.2	100.0
		-----	-----	-----	
	TOTAL	45	100.0	100.0	
Mean	3.467	Std Dev	1.179	Minimum	1.000
Maximum	5.000				
Valid Cases	45	Missing Cases	0		

Part III - Commanders of CS Battalions (Cont)

Q47 BNCOC/ANCOC IMPROVED CAPABILITY TO TRN

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
STRONGLY AGREE	1	10	22.2	22.2	22.2
AGREE	2	27	60.0	60.0	82.2
NEUTRAL	3	7	15.6	15.6	97.8
DISAGREE	4	1	2.2	2.2	100.0
		-----	-----	-----	
	TOTAL	45	100.0	100.0	

Mean 1.978 Std Dev .690 Minimum 1.000  
Maximum 4.000

Valid Cases 45 Missing Cases 0

Q48 JR OFF ABLE TO PLAN, CONDUCT TRNG

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
STRONGLY AGREE	1	11	24.4	24.4	24.4
AGREE	2	26	57.8	57.8	82.2
NEUTRAL	3	6	13.3	13.3	95.6
DISAGREE	4	2	4.4	4.4	100.0
		-----	-----	-----	
	TOTAL	45	100.0	100.0	

Mean 1.978 Std Dev .753 Minimum 1.000  
Maximum 4.000

Valid Cases 45 Missing Cases 0

Q49 SCENARIOS AT CTC SUPPORTED ALB

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
STRONGLY AGREE	1	6	13.3	13.6	13.6
AGREE	2	16	35.6	36.4	50.0
NEUTRAL	3	22	48.9	50.0	100.0
.	.	1	2.2	MISSING	
		-----	-----	-----	
	TOTAL	45	100.0	100.0	

Mean 2.364 Std Dev .718 Minimum 1.000  
Maximum 3.000

Valid Cases 44 Missing Cases 1

Part III - Commanders of CS Battalions (Cont)

Q50 CTC PERFORMANCE ON OER

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
YES, EXPLICITLY	1	7	15.6	17.1	17.1
YES, IMPLICITLY	2	4	8.9	9.8	26.8
NO	3	20	44.4	48.8	75.6
DONT KNOW	4	10	22.2	24.4	100.0
.	.	4	8.9	MISSING	
	TOTAL	45	100.0	100.0	
Mean	2.805	Std Dev	1.005	Minimum	1.000
Maximum	4.000				

Valid Cases 41 Missing Cases 4

Q51 NUMBER OF CTC ROTATIONS

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
NONE	1	16	35.6	35.6	35.6
1	2	4	8.9	8.9	44.4
2	3	3	6.7	6.7	51.1
3	4	2	4.4	4.4	55.6
4 OR MORE	5	10	22.2	22.2	77.8
NA	6	10	22.2	22.2	100.0
	TOTAL	45	100.0	100.0	
Mean	3.356	Std Dev	2.101	Minimum	1.000
Maximum	6.000				

Valid Cases 45 Missing Cases 0

Part III - Commanders of CS Battalions (Cont)

Q52 FREQUENCY OF QTBS

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
NEVER	1	5	11.1	11.1	11.1
SEMI-ANNUALLY	3	10	22.2	22.2	33.3
QUARTERLY	4	30	66.7	66.7	100.0
		-----	-----	-----	
	TOTAL	45	100.0	100.0	
Mean	3.444	Std Dev	.967	Minimum	1.000
Maximum	4.000				
Valid Cases	45	Missing Cases	0		

Q53 ATTAIN STDS FOR INDIV MARKSMENSHIP

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
SOMETIMES	3	4	8.9	8.9	8.9
FREQUENTLY	4	7	15.6	15.6	24.4
ALMOST ALWAYS	5	34	75.6	75.6	100.0
		-----	-----	-----	
	TOTAL	45	100.0	100.0	
Mean	4.667	Std Dev	.640	Minimum	3.000
Maximum	5.000				
Valid Cases	45	Missing Cases	0		

Q54 FREQUENCY OF PT PER WEEK

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
\$3 PER WEEK	1	1	2.2	2.2	2.2
3 PER WEEK	2	29	64.4	64.4	66.7
4 PER WEEK	3	4	8.9	8.9	75.6
5 PER WEEK	4	10	22.2	22.2	97.8
	5	1	2.2	2.2	100.0
		-----	-----	-----	
	TOTAL	45	100.0	100.0	
Mean	2.578	Std Dev	.941	Minimum	1.000
Maximum	5.000				
Valid Cases	45	Missing Cases	0		

Part III - Commanders of CS Battalions (Cont)

Q55 LENGTH OF GARRISON DUTY DAY

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
\$8 HOURS	1	1	2.2	2.3	2.3
8-9 HOURS	2	20	44.4	45.5	47.7
10-11 HOURS	3	23	51.1	52.3	100.0
	.	1	2.2	MISSING	
		-----	-----	-----	
	TOTAL	45	100.0	100.0	
Mean	2.500	Std Dev	.550	Minimum	1.000
Maximum	3.000				
Valid Cases	44	Missing Cases	1		

Q56 OFF PROF DEV PROGRAM

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
YES	1	39	86.7	86.7	86.7
NO	2	6	13.3	13.3	100.0
		-----	-----	-----	
	TOTAL	45	100.0	100.0	
Mean	1.133	Std Dev	.344	Minimum	1.000
Maximum	2.000				
Valid Cases	45	Missing Cases	0		

Q57 HAD SUFFICIENT TRNG DAYS

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
STRONGLY AGREE	1	8	17.8	18.2	18.2
AGREE	2	24	53.3	54.5	72.7
NEUTRAL	3	5	11.1	11.4	84.1
DISAGREE	4	6	13.3	13.6	97.7
STRONGLY DISAGREE	5	1	2.2	2.3	100.0
	.	1	2.2	MISSING	
		-----	-----	-----	
	TOTAL	45	100.0	100.0	
Mean	2.273	Std Dev	.997	Minimum	1.000
Maximum	5.000				
Valid Cases	44	Missing Cases	1		

Part III - Commanders of CS Battalions (Cont)

Q58 NEW SOLDIERS HAD BASIC SOLDIER SKILLS

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
STRONGLY AGREE	1	2	4.4	4.4	4.4
AGREE	2	26	57.8	57.8	62.2
NEUTRAL	3	6	13.3	13.3	75.6
DISAGREE	4	11	24.4	24.4	100.0
		-----	-----	-----	
TOTAL		45	100.0	100.0	

Mean 2.578 Std Dev .917 Minimum 1.000  
Maximum 4.000

Valid Cases 45 Missing Cases 0

Q59 NEW SOLDIERS HAD BASIC MOS SKILLS

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
STRONGLY AGREE	1	1	2.2	2.2	2.2
AGREE	2	13	28.9	28.9	31.1
NEUTRAL	3	14	31.1	31.1	62.2
DISAGREE	4	17	37.8	37.8	100.0
		-----	-----	-----	
TOTAL		45	100.0	100.0	

Mean 3.044 Std Dev .878 Minimum 1.000  
Maximum 4.000

Valid Cases 45 Missing Cases 0

Q60 NCOS KNOW AND ABIL TO TRAIN

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
STRONGLY AGREE	1	2	4.4	4.4	4.4
AGREE	2	30	66.7	66.7	71.1
NEUTRAL	3	5	11.1	11.1	82.2
DISAGREE	4	8	17.8	17.8	100.0
		-----	-----	-----	
TOTAL		45	100.0	100.0	

Mean 2.422 Std Dev .839 Minimum 1.000  
Maximum 4.000

Valid Cases 45 Missing Cases 0

Part III - Commanders of CS Battalions (Cont)

Q61 JR OFF SKILL AND KNOW TO TRAIN

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
STRONGLY AGREE	1	3	6.7	6.7	6.7
AGREE	2	32	71.1	71.1	77.8
NEUTRAL	3	6	13.3	13.3	91.1
DISAGREE	4	3	6.7	6.7	97.8
STRONGLY DISAGREE	5	1	2.2	2.2	100.0
		-----	-----	-----	
	TOTAL	45	100.0	100.0	
Mean	2.267	Std Dev	.780	Minimum	1.000
Maximum	5.000				
Valid Cases	45	Missing Cases	0		

Q62 JR OFF GROUNDED IN UNIT DOCTRINE

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
STRONGLY AGREE	1	3	6.7	6.7	6.7
AGREE	2	14	31.1	31.1	37.8
NEUTRAL	3	15	33.3	33.3	71.1
DISAGREE	4	12	26.7	26.7	97.8
STRONGLY DISAGREE	5	1	2.2	2.2	100.0
		-----	-----	-----	
	TOTAL	45	100.0	100.0	
Mean	2.867	Std Dev	.968	Minimum	1.000
Maximum	5.000				
Valid Cases	45	Missing Cases	0		

Part III - Commanders of CS Battalions (Cont)

Q63 LEAVENWORTH PCC ADEQUATE

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
STRONGLY AGREE	1	3	6.7	7.0	7.0
AGREE	2	29	64.4	67.4	74.4
NEUTRAL	3	7	15.6	16.3	90.7
DISAGREE	4	4	8.9	9.3	100.0
	.	2	4.4	MISSING	
		-----	-----	-----	
	TOTAL	45	100.0	100.0	
Mean	2.279	Std Dev	.734	Minimum	1.000
Maximum	4.000				
Valid Cases	43	Missing Cases	2		

Q64 BRANCH PCC ADEQUATE

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
STRONGLY AGREE	1	3	6.7	7.0	7.0
AGREE	2	27	60.0	62.8	69.8
NEUTRAL	3	8	17.8	18.6	88.4
DISAGREE	4	5	11.1	11.6	100.0
	.	2	4.4	MISSING	
		-----	-----	-----	
	TOTAL	45	100.0	100.0	
Mean	2.349	Std Dev	.783	Minimum	1.000
Maximum	4.000				
Valid Cases	43	Missing Cases	2		



Part III - Commanders of CS Battalions (Cont)

Q65 JR SOLDIERS BETTER EDUCATED THAN NCOS

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
STRONGLY AGREE	1	3	6.7	6.7	6.7
AGREE	2	13	28.9	28.9	35.6
NEUTRAL	3	8	17.8	17.8	53.3
DISAGREE	4	21	46.7	46.7	100.0
		-----	-----	-----	
	TOTAL	45	100.0	100.0	
Mean	3.044	Std Dev	1.021	Minimum	1.000
Maximum	4.000				

Valid Cases 45 Missing Cases 0

-----

Q66 OFF UNDERSTOOD ORG STRUC AND RELTN

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
STRONGLY AGREE	1	1	2.2	2.2	2.2
AGREE	2	35	77.8	77.8	80.0
NEUTRAL	3	3	6.7	6.7	86.7
DISAGREE	4	6	13.3	13.3	100.0
		-----	-----	-----	
	TOTAL	45	100.0	100.0	
Mean	2.311	Std Dev	.733	Minimum	1.000
Maximum	4.000				

Valid Cases 45 Missing Cases 0

Part III - Commanders of CS Battalions (Cont).

Q67 POST COMMAND CLIMATE SATISFACTORY

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
STRONGLY AGREE	1	18	40.0	40.0	40.0
AGREE	2	18	40.0	40.0	80.0
NEUTRAL	3	4	8.9	8.9	88.9
DISAGREE	4	4	8.9	8.9	97.8
STRONGLY DISAGREE	5	1	2.2	2.2	100.0
		-----	-----	-----	
	TOTAL	45	100.0	100.0	

Mean 1.933 Std Dev 1.031 Minimum 1.000  
Maximum 5.000

Valid Cases 45 Missing Cases 0

Q68 CHAIN OF COMMAND VALUES MATCHED YOURS

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
STRONGLY AGREE	1	15	33.3	33.3	33.3
AGREE	2	20	44.4	44.4	77.8
NEUTRAL	3	4	8.9	8.9	86.7
DISAGREE	4	6	13.3	13.3	100.0
		-----	-----	-----	
	TOTAL	45	100.0	100.0	

Mean 2.022 Std Dev .988 Minimum 1.000  
Maximum 4.000

Valid Cases 45 Missing Cases 0

Part III - Commanders of CS Battalions (Cont)

Q69 COC SUPPORTED ACCURATE REPORTING

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
STRONGLY AGREE	1	25	55.6	55.6	55.6
AGREE	2	13	28.9	28.9	84.4
NEUTRAL	3	5	11.1	11.1	95.6
DISAGREE	4	1	2.2	2.2	97.8
STRONGLY DISAGREE	5	1	2.2	2.2	100.0
		-----	-----	-----	
	TOTAL	45	100.0	100.0	
Mean	1.667	Std Dev	.929	Minimum	1.000
Maximum	5.000				
Valid Cases	45	Missing Cases	0		

Q70 ACCURATE ASSESSMENTS AND REPORTS UP

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
STRONGLY AGREE	1	7	15.6	15.6	15.6
AGREE	2	37	82.2	82.2	97.8
NEUTRAL	3	1	2.2	2.2	100.0
		-----	-----	-----	
	TOTAL	45	100.0	100.0	
Mean	1.867	Std Dev	.405	Minimum	1.000
Maximum	3.000				
Valid Cases	45	Missing Cases	0		

Q71 NCO MORAL AND ETHICAL STDS SAT

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
STRONGLY AGREE	1	3	6.7	6.7	6.7
AGREE	2	34	75.6	75.6	82.2
NEUTRAL	3	7	15.6	15.6	97.8
DISAGREE	4	1	2.2	2.2	100.0
		-----	-----	-----	
	TOTAL	45	100.0	100.0	
Mean	2.133	Std Dev	.548	Minimum	1.000
Maximum	4.000				
Valid Cases	45	Missing Cases	0		

Part III - Commanders of CS Battalions (Cont)

Q72 OFF MORAL AND ETHICAL STDS SAT

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
STRONGLY AGREE	1	11	24.4	24.4	24.4
AGREE	2	32	71.1	71.1	95.6
NEUTRAL	3	2	4.4	4.4	100.0
		-----	-----	-----	
	TOTAL	45	100.0	100.0	
Mean	1.800	Std Dev	.505	Minimum	1.000
Maximum	3.000				

Valid Cases 45 Missing Cases 0

Q73 DRUG/ALCOHOL PROBLEM FOR JR EM

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
STRONGLY AGREE	1	1	2.2	2.2	2.2
AGREE	2	10	22.2	22.2	24.4
NEUTRAL	3	4	8.9	8.9	33.3
DISAGREE	4	19	42.2	42.2	75.6
STRONGLY DISAGREE	5	11	24.4	24.4	100.0
		-----	-----	-----	
	TOTAL	45	100.0	100.0	
Mean	3.644	Std Dev	1.151	Minimum	1.000
Maximum	5.000				

Valid Cases 45 Missing Cases 0

Part III - Commanders of CS Battalions (Cont)

Q74 DRUG/ALCOHOL PROBLEM FOR NCOS

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
STRONGLY AGREE	1	2	4.4	4.5	4.5
AGREE	2	6	13.3	13.6	18.2
NEUTRAL	3	5	11.1	11.4	29.5
DISAGREE	4	20	44.4	45.5	75.0
STRONGLY DISAGREE	5	11	24.4	25.0	100.0
	.	1	2.2	MISSING	
		-----	-----	-----	
	TOTAL	45	100.0	100.0	
Mean	3.727	Std Dev	1.128	Minimum	1.000
Maximum	5.000				
Valid Cases	44	Missing Cases	1		

Q75 DRUG/ALCOHOL PROBLEM FOR OFF

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
AGREE	2	2	4.4	4.4	4.4
NEUTRAL	3	2	4.4	4.4	8.9
DISAGREE	4	21	46.7	46.7	55.6
STRONGLY DISAGREE	5	20	44.4	44.4	100.0
		-----	-----	-----	
	TOTAL	45	100.0	100.0	
Mean	4.311	Std Dev	.763	Minimum	2.000
Maximum	5.000				
Valid Cases	45	Missing Cases	0		

Q79 UCMJ ACTIONS PER MONTH

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
0-5	1	38	84.4	90.5	90.5
6-10	2	3	6.7	7.1	97.6
11-15	3	1	2.2	2.4	100.0
	.	3	6.7	MISSING	
		-----	-----	-----	
	TOTAL	45	100.0	100.0	
Mean	1.119	Std Dev	.395	Minimum	1.000
Maximum	3.000				
Valid Cases	42	Missing Cases	3		

Part III - Commanders of CS Battalions (Cont)

Q81           FREQ MENTORED BY CDR

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
DAILY	1	2	4.4	4.5	4.5
WEEKLY	2	9	20.0	20.5	25.0
MONTHLY	3	9	20.0	20.5	45.5
QUARTERLY	4	9	20.0	20.5	65.9
ANNUALLY	5	3	6.7	6.8	72.7
AT OER TIME	6	5	11.1	11.4	84.1
NEVER	7	7	15.6	15.9	100.0
	.	1	2.2	MISSING	
		-----	-----	-----	
	TOTAL	45	100.0	100.0	

Mean           4.023           Std Dev           1.861           Minimum           1.000  
Maximum       7.000

Valid Cases       44           Missing Cases       1

-----  
Q82           FREQ COUNSELED SUBORDINATES

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
DAILY	1	3	6.7	7.0	7.0
WEEKLY	2	10	22.2	23.3	30.2
MONTHLY	3	14	31.1	32.6	62.8
QUARTERLY	4	15	33.3	34.9	97.7
ANNUALLY	5	1	2.2	2.3	100.0
	.	2	4.4	MISSING	
		-----	-----	-----	
	TOTAL	45	100.0	100.0	

Mean           3.023           Std Dev           .988           Minimum           1.000  
Maximum       5.000

Valid Cases       43           Missing Cases       2

Part III - Commanders of CS Battalions (Cont)

Q83      FREQ POSITIVE WRITTEN COUNSELING

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
MONTHLY	3	7	15.6	16.3	16.3
QUARTERLY	4	22	48.9	51.2	67.4
ANNUALLY	5	1	2.2	2.3	69.8
AT OER TIME	6	6	13.3	14.0	83.7
NEVER	7	7	15.6	16.3	100.0
	.	2	4.4	MISSING	
		-----	-----	-----	
	TOTAL	45	100.0	100.0	
Mean	4.628	Std Dev	1.363	Minimum	3.000
Maximum	7.000				

Valid Cases      43      Missing Cases      2

Q84      YOUR FREEDOM TO COMMAND

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
LOW	1	2	4.4	4.5	4.5
MODERATE	2	4	8.9	9.1	13.6
HIGH	3	38	84.4	86.4	100.0
	.	1	2.2	MISSING	
		-----	-----	-----	
	TOTAL	45	100.0	100.0	
Mean	2.818	Std Dev	.495	Minimum	1.000
Maximum	3.000				

Valid Cases      44      Missing Cases      1

Part III - Commanders of CS Battalions (Cont)

Q85 YOUR SUBORDINATES FREEDOM TO CMD

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
LOW	1	1	2.2	2.3	2.3
MODERATE	2	16	35.6	36.4	38.6
HIGH	3	27	60.0	61.4	100.0
.	.	1	2.2	MISSING	
TOTAL		45	100.0	100.0	
Mean	2.591	Std Dev	.542	Minimum	1.000
Maximum	3.000				
Valid Cases	44	Missing Cases	1		

Q86 IMPORTANCE OF STATISTICS

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
NO IMPORTANCE	1	3	6.7	6.8	6.8
NOT ENOUGH	2	2	4.4	4.5	11.4
ABOUT RIGHT	3	31	68.9	70.5	81.8
A LITTLE TOO MUCH	4	7	15.6	15.9	97.7
ENTIRELY TOO MUCH	5	1	2.2	2.3	100.0
.	.	1	2.2	MISSING	
TOTAL		45	100.0	100.0	
Mean	3.023	Std Dev	.762	Minimum	1.000
Maximum	5.000				
Valid Cases	44	Missing Cases	1		

Q87 YOUR SENIOR RATER PROFILE KNOWN

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
YES	1	44	97.8	100.0	100.0
.	.	1	2.2	MISSING	
TOTAL		45	100.0	100.0	
Mean	1.000	Std Dev	0.0	Minimum	1.000
Maximum	1.000				
Valid Cases	44	Missing Cases	1		



Part III - Commanders of CS Battalions (Cont)

Q88 DISCUSS RATINGS WITH SUBORDINATES

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
YES	1	41	91.1	93.2	93.2
NO	2	3	6.7	6.8	100.0
	.	1	2.2	MISSING	
		-----	-----	-----	
	TOTAL	45	100.0	100.0	
Mean	1.068	Std Dev	.255	Minimum	1.000
Maximum	2.000				
Valid Cases	44	Missing Cases	1		

Q89 YOUR SENIOR RATER'S PROFILE KNOWN

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
YES	1	17	37.8	41.5	41.5
NO	2	24	53.3	58.5	100.0
	.	4	8.9	MISSING	
		-----	-----	-----	
	TOTAL	45	100.0	100.0	
Mean	1.585	Std Dev	.499	Minimum	1.000
Maximum	2.000				
Valid Cases	41	Missing Cases	4		

Q90 RATER DISCUSSED YOUR REPORT PRIOR

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
YES	1	25	55.6	61.0	61.0
NO	2	16	35.6	39.0	100.0
	.	4	8.9	MISSING	
		-----	-----	-----	
	TOTAL	45	100.0	100.0	
Mean	1.390	Std Dev	.494	Minimum	1.000
Maximum	2.000				
Valid Cases	41	Missing Cases	4		

Part III - Commanders of CS Battalions (Cont)

Q91 SR RTR DISCUSSED YOUR REPORT PRIOR

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
YES	1	8	17.8	19.0	19.0
NO	2	33	73.3	78.6	97.6
	4	1	2.2	2.4	100.0
	.	3	6.7	MISSING	
		-----	-----	-----	
	TOTAL	45	100.0	100.0	
Mean	1.857	Std Dev	.521	Minimum	1.000
Maximum	4.000				

Valid Cases 42 Missing Cases 3

Q92 SUPPORT FROM HIGHER HEADQUARTERS

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
VERY DISSATISFIED	1	5	11.1	11.4	11.4
DISSATISFIED	2	4	8.9	9.1	20.5
BORDERLINE	3	5	11.1	11.4	31.8
SATISFIED	4	20	44.4	45.5	77.3
VERY SATISFIED	5	10	22.2	22.7	100.0
	.	1	2.2	MISSING	
		-----	-----	-----	
	TOTAL	45	100.0	100.0	
Mean	3.591	Std Dev	1.263	Minimum	1.000
Maximum	5.000				

Valid Cases 44 Missing Cases 1

Part III - Commanders of CS Battalions (Cont)

Q93 HIGHER CDRS KNEW YOUR UNIT STATUS

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
VERY DISSATISFIED	1	3	6.7	6.8	6.8
DISSATISFIED	2	6	13.3	13.6	20.5
BORDERLINE	3	4	8.9	9.1	29.5
SATISFIED	4	16	35.6	36.4	65.9
VERY SATISFIED	5	15	33.3	34.1	100.0
.	.	1	2.2	MISSING	
		-----	-----	-----	
	TOTAL	45	100.0	100.0	
Mean	3.773	Std Dev	1.255	Minimum	1.000
Maximum	5.000				

Valid Cases 44 Missing Cases 1

Q94 FREQ OF IMMEDIATE CDR VISITS

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
NEVER	1	1	2.2	2.3	2.3
WEEKLY	2	8	17.8	18.6	20.9
MONTHLY	3	16	35.6	37.2	58.1
QUARTERLY	4	14	31.1	32.6	90.7
SEMI-ANNUALLY	5	4	8.9	9.3	100.0
.	.	2	4.4	MISSING	
		-----	-----	-----	
	TOTAL	45	100.0	100.0	
Mean	3.279	Std Dev	.959	Minimum	1.000
Maximum	5.000				

Valid Cases 43 Missing Cases 2

Part III - Commanders of CS Battalions (Cont)

Q95 SENIOR CDRS WOULD SPT IN HARD TIMES

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
STRONGLY AGREE	1	19	42.2	44.2	44.2
AGREE	2	17	37.8	39.5	83.7
NEUTRAL	3	1	2.2	2.3	86.0
DISAGREE	4	3	6.7	7.0	93.0
STRONGLY DISAGREE	5	3	6.7	7.0	100.0
	.	2	4.4	MISSING	
	TOTAL	45	100.0	100.0	
Mean	1.930	Std Dev	1.183	Minimum	1.000
Maximum	5.000				

Valid Cases 43 Missing Cases 2

Q96 SAT CMD CLIMATE FROM HIGHER HQ

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
STRONGLY AGREE	1	18	40.0	40.9	40.9
AGREE	2	14	31.1	31.8	72.7
NEUTRAL	3	7	15.6	15.9	88.6
DISAGREE	4	4	8.9	9.1	97.7
STRONGLY DISAGREE	5	1	2.2	2.3	100.0
	.	1	2.2	MISSING	
	TOTAL	45	100.0	100.0	
Mean	2.000	Std Dev	1.078	Minimum	1.000
Maximum	5.000				

Valid Cases 44 Missing Cases 1

Part III - Commanders of CS Battalions (Cont)

Q97 CHAIN OF CMD FAIR TO COMMANDERS

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
YES	1	38	84.4	86.4	86.4
NO	2	5	11.1	11.4	97.7
	4	1	2.2	2.3	100.0
	.	1	2.2	MISSING	
		-----	-----	-----	
	TOTAL	45	100.0	100.0	
Mean	1.182	Std Dev	.540	Minimum	1.000
Maximum	4.000				

Valid Cases 44 Missing Cases 1

Q98 HOW POSITIVE ABOUT ARMY CAREER

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
MUCH MORE POSITIVELY	1	11	24.4	25.6	25.6
MORE POSITIVELY	2	16	35.6	37.2	62.8
ABOUT THE SAME	3	12	26.7	27.9	90.7
LESS POSITIVELY	4	4	8.9	9.3	100.0
	.	2	4.4	MISSING	
		-----	-----	-----	
	TOTAL	45	100.0	100.0	
Mean	2.209	Std Dev	.940	Minimum	1.000
Maximum	4.000				

Valid Cases 43 Missing Cases 2

# Part IV - Results for Commanders of Combat Service Support Battalions

## Q11 ACCOMPANIED TOUR

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
YES WITH SPOUSE	1	50	90.9	90.9	90.9
YES WITHOUT SPOUSE	2	1	1.8	1.8	92.7
NO	3	1	1.8	1.8	94.5
N/A	4	3	5.5	5.5	100.0
		-----	-----	-----	
	TOTAL	55	100.0	100.0	

Mean 1.218 Std Dev .738 Minimum 1.000  
Maximum 4.000

Valid Cases 55 Missing Cases 0

## Q12 LIVED ON POST

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
YES	1	40	72.7	72.7	72.7
NO	2	15	27.3	27.3	100.0
		-----	-----	-----	
	TOTAL	55	100.0	100.0	

Mean 1.273 Std Dev .449 Minimum 1.000  
Maximum 2.000

Valid Cases 55 Missing Cases 0

## Q13 SPOUSE PARTICIPATION

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
ALMOST NEVER	1	2	3.6	3.8	3.8
SELDOM	2	1	1.8	1.9	5.7
SOMETIMES	3	5	9.1	9.4	15.1
FREQUENTLY	4	13	23.6	24.5	39.6
ALMOST ALWAYS	5	32	58.2	60.4	100.0
.	.	2	3.6	MISSING	
		-----	-----	-----	
	TOTAL	55	100.0	100.0	

Mean 4.358 Std Dev 1.002 Minimum 1.000  
Maximum 5.000

Valid Cases 53 Missing Cases 2

Part IV - Commanders of CSS Battalions (Cont)

Q14 SPOUSE EMPLOYMENT

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
FULL TIME	1	11	20.0	21.2	21.2
PART TIME	2	11	20.0	21.2	42.3
NOT OUTSIDE HOME	3	29	52.7	55.8	98.1
	4	1	1.8	1.9	100.0
	.	3	5.5	MISSING	
		-----	-----	-----	
	TOTAL	55	100.0	100.0	
Mean	2.385	Std Dev	.844	Minimum	1.000
Maximum	4.000				

Valid Cases 52 Missing Cases 3

Q15 DIRECT INPUT IN DEVELOPING COB

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
YES	1	39	70.9	73.6	73.6
SOMETIMES	2	8	14.5	15.1	88.7
NO	3	5	9.1	9.4	98.1
	5	1	1.8	1.9	100.0
	.	2	3.6	MISSING	
		-----	-----	-----	
	TOTAL	55	100.0	100.0	
Mean	1.415	Std Dev	.819	Minimum	1.000
Maximum	5.000				

Valid Cases 53 Missing Cases 2

Part IV - Commanders of CSS Battalions (Cont)

Q16 PERCENT TIME ON BUDGET MANAGEMENT

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
\$10%	1	34	61.8	61.8	61.8
11-20%	2	15	27.3	27.3	89.1
21-30%	3	3	5.5	5.5	94.5
31-40%	4	2	3.6	3.6	98.2
41-50%	5	1	1.8	1.8	100.0
		-----	-----	-----	
	TOTAL	55	100.0	100.0	
Mean	1.564	Std Dev	.898	Minimum	1.000
Maximum	5.000				

Valid Cases 55 Missing Cases 0

Q17 ENOUGH AMMUNITION FOR STRAC

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
YES	1	30	54.5	55.6	55.6
NO	2	16	29.1	29.6	85.2
NA	3	8	14.5	14.8	100.0
	.	1	1.8	MISSING	
		-----	-----	-----	
	TOTAL	55	100.0	100.0	
Mean	1.593	Std Dev	.740	Minimum	1.000
Maximum	3.000				

Valid Cases 54 Missing Cases 1



Part IV - Commanders of CSS Battalions (Cont)

Q18 SUFFICIENT TRAINING FUNDS

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
ALMOST NEVER	1	1	1.8	1.8	1.8
SELDOM	2	3	5.5	5.5	7.3
SOMETIMES	3	7	12.7	12.7	20.0
FREQUENTLY	4	11	20.0	20.0	40.0
ALMOST ALWAYS	5	33	60.0	60.0	100.0
		-----	-----	-----	
	TOTAL	55	100.0	100.0	
Mean	4.309	Std Dev	1.016	Minimum	1.000
Maximum	5.000				

Valid Cases 55 Missing Cases 0

Q19 AVERAGE PERSONNEL TURNOVER RATE

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
\$10%	1	22	40.0	40.0	40.0
11-15%	2	26	47.3	47.3	87.3
16-20%	3	6	10.9	10.9	98.2
21-25%	4	1	1.8	1.8	100.0
		-----	-----	-----	
	TOTAL	55	100.0	100.0	
Mean	1.745	Std Dev	.726	Minimum	1.000
Maximum	4.000				

Valid Cases 55 Missing Cases 0

Part IV - Commanders of CSS Battalions (Cont)

Q20 AVAILABILITY OF TRAINING RESOURCES

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
ALMOST NEVER	1	3	5.5	5.5	5.5
SELDOM	2	4	7.3	7.3	12.7
SOMETIMES	3	10	18.2	18.2	30.9
FREQUENTLY	4	27	49.1	49.1	80.0
ALMOST ALWAYS	5	11	20.0	20.0	100.0
		-----	-----	-----	
	TOTAL	55	100.0	100.0	
Mean	3.709	Std Dev	1.048	Minimum	1.000
Maximum	5.000				

Valid Cases 55 Missing Cases 0

Q21 UFRS INHIBITED TRAINING

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
ALMOST NEVER	1	14	25.5	25.5	25.5
SELDOM	2	23	41.8	41.8	67.3
SOMETIMES	3	15	27.3	27.3	94.5
FREQUENTLY	4	3	5.5	5.5	100.0
		-----	-----	-----	
	TOTAL	55	100.0	100.0	
Mean	2.127	Std Dev	.862	Minimum	1.000
Maximum	4.000				

Valid Cases 55 Missing Cases 0

Part IV - Commanders of CSS Battalions (Cont)

Q22 ALO

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
1	1	20	36.4	36.4	36.4
2	2	20	36.4	36.4	72.7
3	3	5	9.1	9.1	81.8
NA	4	9	16.4	16.4	98.2
	5	1	1.8	1.8	100.0
		-----	-----	-----	
	TOTAL	55	100.0	100.0	

Mean 2.109 Std Dev 1.133 Minimum 1.000  
Maximum 5.000

Valid Cases 55 Missing Cases 0

Q23 CRITICAL RESOURCES SHARED

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
DONT KNOW	1	4	7.3	7.4	7.4
NOT AT ALL	2	9	16.4	16.7	24.1
SLIGHTLY	3	13	23.6	24.1	48.1
MODERATELY	4	23	41.8	42.6	90.7
GREATLY	5	5	9.1	9.3	100.0
	.	1	1.8	MISSING	
		-----	-----	-----	
	TOTAL	55	100.0	100.0	

Mean 3.296 Std Dev 1.093 Minimum 1.000  
Maximum 5.000

Valid Cases 54 Missing Cases 1

Part IV - Commanders of CSS Battalions (Cont)

Q24 CRITICAL RESOURCES CROSSLEVELED

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
DONT KNOW	1	2	3.6	3.6	3.6
NOT AT ALL	2	2	3.6	3.6	7.3
SLIGHTLY	3	20	36.4	36.4	43.6
MODERATELY	4	22	40.0	40.0	83.6
GREATLY	5	9	16.4	16.4	100.0
		-----	-----	-----	
	TOTAL	55	100.0	100.0	
Mean	3.618	Std Dev	.933	Minimum	1.000
Maximum	5.000				
Valid Cases	55	Missing Cases	0		

Q25 OTHER UNITS WITH HIGHER PRIORITY

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
YES	1	26	47.3	49.1	49.1
NO	2	27	49.1	50.9	100.0
	.	2	3.6	MISSING	
		-----	-----	-----	
	TOTAL	55	100.0	100.0	
Mean	1.509	Std Dev	.505	Minimum	1.000
Maximum	2.000				
Valid Cases	53	Missing Cases	2		

Q26 FACILITY AVAIL DEGRADED TRAINING

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
NOT AT ALL	2	17	30.9	30.9	30.9
SLIGHTLY	3	23	41.8	41.8	72.7
MODERATELY	4	14	25.5	25.5	98.2
GREATLY	5	1	1.8	1.8	100.0
		-----	-----	-----	
	TOTAL	55	100.0	100.0	
Mean	2.982	Std Dev	.805	Minimum	2.000
Maximum	5.000				
Valid Cases	55	Missing Cases	0		

Part IV - Commandres of CSS Battalions (Cont)

Q27 MOS SHORTAGES DEGRADED EFFECTIVENESS

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
NOT AT ALL	2	6	10.9	10.9	10.9
SLIGHTLY	3	33	60.0	60.0	70.9
MODERATELY	4	15	27.3	27.3	98.2
GREATLY	5	1	1.8	1.8	100.0
		-----	-----	-----	
	TOTAL	55	100.0	100.0	
Mean	3.200	Std Dev	.650	Minimum	2.000
Maximum	5.000				

Valid Cases 55 Missing Cases 0

Q28 TOTAL COB

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
\$\$1 M	1	25	45.5	45.5	45.5
\$1-5 M	2	20	36.4	36.4	81.8
\$6-10 M	3	4	7.3	7.3	89.1
¶\$10 M	4	6	10.9	10.9	100.0
		-----	-----	-----	
	TOTAL	55	100.0	100.0	
Mean	1.836	Std Dev	.977	Minimum	1.000
Maximum	4.000				

Valid Cases 55 Missing Cases 0

Part IV - Commanders of CSS Battalions (Cont)

Q29 ALO CONSTRAINED READINESS

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
STRONGLY AGREE	1	2	3.6	3.7	3.7
AGREE	2	14	25.5	25.9	29.6
NEUTRAL	3	12	21.8	22.2	51.9
DISAGREE	4	14	25.5	25.9	77.8
STRONGLY DISAGREE	5	12	21.8	22.2	100.0
.	.	1	1.8	MISSING	
		-----	-----	-----	
	TOTAL	55	100.0	100.0	
Mean	3.370	Std Dev	1.202	Minimum	1.000
Maximum	5.000				

Valid Cases 54 Missing Cases 1

Q30 REPAIR PARTS REQUISITIONS DEFERRED

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
ALMOST NEVER	1	33	60.0	61.1	61.1
SELDOM	2	9	16.4	16.7	77.8
SOMETIMES	3	11	20.0	20.4	98.1
FREQUENTLY	4	1	1.8	1.9	100.0
.	.	1	1.8	MISSING	
		-----	-----	-----	
	TOTAL	55	100.0	100.0	
Mean	1.630	Std Dev	.875	Minimum	1.000
Maximum	4.000				

Valid Cases 54 Missing Cases 1

Part IV - Commanders of CSS Battalions (Cont)

Q31 BASIS FOR BUDGET

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
PROJECTED EVENTS	1	28	50.9	50.9	50.9
PRIOR EXPENDITURES	2	17	30.9	30.9	81.8
OTHER	3	10	18.2	18.2	100.0
		-----	-----	-----	
	TOTAL	55	100.0	100.0	
Mean	1.673	Std Dev	.771	Minimum	1.000
Maximum	3.000				

Valid Cases 55 Missing Cases 0

Q32 SUFFICIENT RESOURCES FOR TRAINING

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
ALL I DESIRED	1	10	18.2	18.2	18.2
MOST I DESIRED	2	33	60.0	60.0	78.2
ONLY REQUIRED	3	9	16.4	16.4	94.5
LESS THAN REQUIRED	4	2	3.6	3.6	98.2
MUCH LESS	5	1	1.8	1.8	100.0
		-----	-----	-----	
	TOTAL	55	100.0	100.0	
Mean	2.109	Std Dev	.809	Minimum	1.000
Maximum	5.000				

Valid Cases 55 Missing Cases 0

Part IV - Commanders of CSS Battalions (Cont)

Q33 TRAINING DEVELOPMENT BASED ON 25 SERIES

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
STRONGLY AGREE	1	26	47.3	47.3	47.3
AGREE	2	18	32.7	32.7	80.0
NEUTRAL	3	8	14.5	14.5	94.5
DISAGREE	4	1	1.8	1.8	96.4
STRONGLY DISAGREE	5	2	3.6	3.6	100.0
		-----	-----	-----	
	TOTAL	55	100.0	100.0	
Mean	1.818	Std Dev	1.002	Minimum	1.000
Maximum	5.000				
Valid Cases	55	Missing Cases	0		

Q34 CLEAR TRNG GUIDANCE FROM SENIOR HQ

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
STRONGLY AGREE	1	18	32.7	32.7	32.7
AGREE	2	28	50.9	50.9	83.6
NEUTRAL	3	4	7.3	7.3	90.9
DISAGREE	4	3	5.5	5.5	96.4
STRONGLY DISAGREE	5	2	3.6	3.6	100.0
		-----	-----	-----	
	TOTAL	55	100.0	100.0	
Mean	1.964	Std Dev	.981	Minimum	1.000
Maximum	5.000				
Valid Cases	55	Missing Cases	0		



Part IV - Commanders of CSS Battalions (Cont)

Q35 TRNG GUIDANCE SUPPORTED TOUGH TRNG

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
STRONGLY AGREE	1	19	34.5	34.5	34.5
AGREE	2	29	52.7	52.7	87.3
NEUTRAL	3	4	7.3	7.3	94.5
DISAGREE	4	2	3.6	3.6	98.2
STRONGLY DISAGREE	5	1	1.8	1.8	100.0
		-----	-----	-----	
	TOTAL	55	100.0	100.0	
Mean	1.855	Std Dev	.848	Minimum	1.000
Maximum	5.000				

Valid Cases 55 Missing Cases 0

Q36 SAME TRNG AREAS DEGRADED TRNG

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
STRONGLY AGREE	1	1	1.8	1.8	1.8
AGREE	2	16	29.1	29.1	30.9
NEUTRAL	3	14	25.5	25.5	56.4
DISAGREE	4	19	34.5	34.5	90.9
STRONGLY DISAGREE	5	5	9.1	9.1	100.0
		-----	-----	-----	
	TOTAL	55	100.0	100.0	
Mean	3.200	Std Dev	1.026	Minimum	1.000
Maximum	5.000				

Valid Cases 55 Missing Cases 0

Part IV - Commanders of CSS Battalions (Cont)

Q37 FREQUENCY OF OFF POST TRNG

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
ALMOST NEVER	1	3	5.5	5.5	5.5
SELDOM	2	2	3.6	3.6	9.1
SOMETIMES	3	20	36.4	36.4	45.5
FREQUENTLY	4	22	40.0	40.0	85.5
ALMOST ALWAYS	5	8	14.5	14.5	100.0
		-----	-----	-----	
	TOTAL	55	100.0	100.0	
Mean	3.545	Std Dev	.978	Minimum	1.000
Maximum	5.000				

Valid Cases 55 Missing Cases 0

Q38 TRNG BASED ON MTPS

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
STRONGLY AGREE	1	3	5.5	5.6	5.6
AGREE	2	9	16.4	16.7	22.2
NEUTRAL	3	10	18.2	18.5	40.7
DISAGREE	4	12	21.8	22.2	63.0
STRONGLY DISAGREE	5	20	36.4	37.0	100.0
	.	1	1.8	MISSING	
		-----	-----	-----	
	TOTAL	55	100.0	100.0	
Mean	3.685	Std Dev	1.286	Minimum	1.000
Maximum	5.000				

Valid Cases 54 Missing Cases 1

Part IV - Commanders of CSS Battalions (Cont)

Q39 MTPS PROVIDED BASIS FOR TOUGH TRNG

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
STRONGLY AGREE	1	3	5.5	5.7	5.7
AGREE	2	11	20.0	20.8	26.4
NEUTRAL	3	27	49.1	50.9	77.4
DISAGREE	4	5	9.1	9.4	86.8
STRONGLY DISAGREE	5	7	12.7	13.2	100.0
	.	2	3.6	MISSING	
		-----	-----	-----	
	TOTAL	55	100.0	100.0	
Mean	3.038	Std Dev	1.037	Minimum	1.000
Maximum	5.000				

Valid Cases 53 Missing Cases 2

Q41 HIGHER HQ CHANGES HINDERED TRNG

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
ALMOST NEVER	1	5	9.1	9.1	9.1
SELDOM	2	11	20.0	20.0	29.1
SOMETIMES	3	22	40.0	40.0	69.1
FREQUENTLY	4	15	27.3	27.3	96.4
ALMOST ALWAYS	5	2	3.6	3.6	100.0
		-----	-----	-----	
	TOTAL	55	100.0	100.0	
Mean	2.964	Std Dev	.999	Minimum	1.000
Maximum	5.000				

Valid Cases 55 Missing Cases 0

Part IV - Commanders of CSS Battalions (Cont)

Q42 HIGHER HQ DIRECTIVES ENHANCED TRNG

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
STRONGLY AGREE	1	5	9.1	9.1	9.1
AGREE	2	21	38.2	38.2	47.3
NEUTRAL	3	20	36.4	36.4	83.6
DISAGREE	4	8	14.5	14.5	98.2
STRONGLY DISAGREE	5	1	1.8	1.8	100.0
		-----	-----	-----	
	TOTAL	55	100.0	100.0	
Mean	2.618	Std Dev	.913	Minimum	1.000
Maximum	5.000				

Valid Cases 55 Missing Cases 0

Q43 TRNG INCLUDED COMBINED ARMS AND SLICE

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
ALMOST NEVER	1	15	27.3	27.8	27.8
SELDOM	2	8	14.5	14.8	42.6
SOMETIMES	3	6	10.9	11.1	53.7
FREQUENTLY	4	18	32.7	33.3	87.0
ALMOST ALWAYS	5	7	12.7	13.0	100.0
	.	1	1.8	MISSING	
		-----	-----	-----	
	TOTAL	55	100.0	100.0	
Mean	2.889	Std Dev	1.462	Minimum	1.000
Maximum	5.000				

Valid Cases 54 Missing Cases 1

Part IV - Commanders of CSS Battalions (Cont)

Q44 TRNG WAS JOINT

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
ALMOST NEVER	1	24	43.6	44.4	44.4
SELDOM	2	7	12.7	13.0	57.4
SOMETIMES	3	12	21.8	22.2	79.6
FREQUENTLY	4	2	3.6	3.7	83.3
ALMOST ALWAYS	5	2	3.6	3.7	87.0
	6	7	12.7	13.0	100.0
	.	1	1.8	MISSING	
		-----	-----	-----	
	TOTAL	55	100.0	100.0	
Mean	2.481	Std Dev	1.746	Minimum	1.000
Maximum	6.000				

Valid Cases 54 Missing Cases 1

Q45 NCOS ABILITY TO PLAN AND CONDUCT TRNG

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
STRONGLY AGREE	1	5	9.1	9.1	9.1
AGREE	2	29	52.7	52.7	61.8
NEUTRAL	3	6	10.9	10.9	72.7
DISAGREE	4	15	27.3	27.3	100.0
		-----	-----	-----	
	TOTAL	55	100.0	100.0	
Mean	2.564	Std Dev	.996	Minimum	1.000
Maximum	4.000				

Valid Cases 55 Missing Cases 0

Part IV - Commanders of CSS Battalions (Cont)

Q46 OK TO TRNSFR INDIV TRNG FROM AIT TO UNIT

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
STRONGLY AGREE	1	2	3.6	3.7	3.7
AGREE	2	11	20.0	20.4	24.1
NEUTRAL	3	2	3.6	3.7	27.8
DISAGREE	4	21	38.2	38.9	66.7
STRONGLY DISAGREE	5	18	32.7	33.3	100.0
	.	1	1.8	MISSING	
	TOTAL	55	100.0	100.0	
Mean	3.778	Std Dev	1.223	Minimum	1.000
Maximum	5.000				

Valid Cases 54 Missing Cases 1

Q47 BNCOC/ANCOC IMPROVED CAPABILITY TO TRN

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
STRONGLY AGREE	1	16	29.1	29.1	29.1
AGREE	2	29	52.7	52.7	81.8
NEUTRAL	3	8	14.5	14.5	96.4
DISAGREE	4	2	3.6	3.6	100.0
	TOTAL	55	100.0	100.0	
Mean	1.927	Std Dev	.766	Minimum	1.000
Maximum	4.000				

Valid Cases 55 Missing Cases 0

Part IV - Commanders of CSS Battalions (Cont)

Q48 JR OFF ABLE TO PLAN, CONDUCT TRNG

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
STRONGLY AGREE	1	11	20.0	20.0	20.0
AGREE	2	31	56.4	56.4	76.4
NEUTRAL	3	11	20.0	20.0	96.4
DISAGREE	4	2	3.6	3.6	100.0
		-----	-----	-----	
	TOTAL	55	100.0	100.0	
Mean	2.073	Std Dev	.742	Minimum	1.000
Maximum	4.000				

Valid Cases 55 Missing Cases 0

Q49 SCENARIOS AT CTC SUPPORTED ALB

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
STRONGLY AGREE	1	11	20.0	21.6	21.6
AGREE	2	12	21.8	23.5	45.1
NEUTRAL	3	25	45.5	49.0	94.1
DISAGREE	4	3	5.5	5.9	100.0
	.	4	7.3	MISSING	
		-----	-----	-----	
	TOTAL	55	100.0	100.0	
Mean	2.392	Std Dev	.896	Minimum	1.000
Maximum	4.000				

Valid Cases 51 Missing Cases 4

Part IV - Commanders of CSS Battalions (Cont)

Q50 CTC PERFORMANCE ON OER

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
YES, EXPLICITLY	1	11	20.0	24.4	24.4
YES, IMPLICITLY	2	8	14.5	17.8	42.2
NO	3	17	30.9	37.8	80.0
DONT KNOW	4	7	12.7	15.6	95.6
	5	1	1.8	2.2	97.8
	6	1	1.8	2.2	100.0
	.	10	18.2	MISSING	
		-----	-----	-----	
	TOTAL	55	100.0	100.0	
Mean	2.600	Std Dev	1.214	Minimum	1.000
Maximum	6.000				

Valid Cases 45 Missing Cases 10

Q51 NUMBER OF CTC ROTATIONS

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
NONE	1	20	36.4	37.0	37.0
1	2	5	9.1	9.3	46.3
2	3	6	10.9	11.1	57.4
3	4	5	9.1	9.3	66.7
4 OR MORE	5	5	9.1	9.3	75.9
NA	6	13	23.6	24.1	100.0
	.	1	1.8	MISSING	
		-----	-----	-----	
	TOTAL	55	100.0	100.0	
Mean	3.167	Std Dev	2.063	Minimum	1.000
Maximum	6.000				

Valid Cases 54 Missing Cases 1



Part IV - Commanders of CSS Battalions (Cont)

Q52 FREQUENCY OF QTBS

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
NEVER	1	5	9.1	9.1	9.1
SEMI-ANNUALLY	3	7	12.7	12.7	21.8
QUARTERLY	4	43	78.2	78.2	100.0
		-----	-----	-----	
	TOTAL	55	100.0	100.0	
Mean	3.600	Std Dev	.894	Minimum	1.000
Maximum	4.000				

Valid Cases 55 Missing Cases 0

-----

Q53 ATTAIN STDS FOR INDIV MARKSMENSHIP

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
SELDOM	2	2	3.6	3.6	3.6
SOMETIMES	3	3	5.5	5.5	9.1
FREQUENTLY	4	9	16.4	16.4	25.5
ALMOST ALWAYS	5	40	72.7	72.7	98.2
NA	6	1	1.8	1.8	100.0
		-----	-----	-----	
	TOTAL	55	100.0	100.0	
Mean	4.636	Std Dev	.778	Minimum	2.000
Maximum	6.000				

Valid Cases 55 Missing Cases 0

Part IV - Commanders of CSS Battalions (Cont)

Q54 FREQUENCY OF PT PER WEEK

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
\$3 PER WEEK	1	2	3.6	3.6	3.6
3 PER WEEK	2	36	65.5	65.5	69.1
4 PER WEEK	3	9	16.4	16.4	85.5
5 PER WEEK	4	8	14.5	14.5	100.0
		-----	-----	-----	
	TOTAL	55	100.0	100.0	
Mean	2.418	Std Dev	.786	Minimum	1.000
Maximum	4.000				

Valid Cases 55 Missing Cases 0

Q55 LENGTH OF GARRISON DUTY DAY

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
\$8 HOURS	1	8	14.5	14.5	14.5
8-9 HOURS	2	17	30.9	30.9	45.5
10-11 HOURS	3	22	40.0	40.0	85.5
12 HOURS	4	4	7.3	7.3	92.7
¶12 HOURS	5	4	7.3	7.3	100.0
		-----	-----	-----	
	TOTAL	55	100.0	100.0	
Mean	2.618	Std Dev	1.063	Minimum	1.000
Maximum	5.000				

Valid Cases 55 Missing Cases 0

Part IV - Commanders of CSS Battalions (Cont)

Q56 OFF PROF DEV PROGRAM

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
YES	1	47	85.5	85.5	85.5
NO	2	8	14.5	14.5	100.0
		-----	-----	-----	
	TOTAL	55	100.0	100.0	

Mean 1.145 Std Dev .356 Minimum 1.000  
Maximum 2.000

Valid Cases 55 Missing Cases 0

Q57 HAD SUFFICIENT TRNG DAYS

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
STRONGLY AGREE	1	7	12.7	12.7	12.7
AGREE	2	25	45.5	45.5	58.2
NEUTRAL	3	5	9.1	9.1	67.3
DISAGREE	4	15	27.3	27.3	94.5
STRONGLY DISAGREE	5	3	5.5	5.5	100.0
		-----	-----	-----	
	TOTAL	55	100.0	100.0	

Mean 2.673 Std Dev 1.171 Minimum 1.000  
Maximum 5.000

Valid Cases 55 Missing Cases 0

Q58 NEW SOLDIERS HAD BASIC SOLDIER SKILLS

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
STRONGLY AGREE	1	1	1.8	1.8	1.8
AGREE	2	26	47.3	47.3	49.1
NEUTRAL	3	6	10.9	10.9	60.0
DISAGREE	4	18	32.7	32.7	92.7
STRONGLY DISAGREE	5	4	7.3	7.3	100.0
		-----	-----	-----	
	TOTAL	55	100.0	100.0	

Mean 2.964 Std Dev 1.088 Minimum 1.000  
Maximum 5.000

Valid Cases 55 Missing Cases 0

Part IV - Commanders of CSS Battalions (Cont)

Q59 NEW SOLDIERS HAD BASIC MOS SKILLS

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
AGREE	2	17	30.9	31.5	31.5
NEUTRAL	3	9	16.4	16.7	48.1
DISAGREE	4	26	47.3	48.1	96.3
STRONGLY DISAGREE	5	2	3.6	3.7	100.0
	.	1	1.8	MISSING	
		-----	-----	-----	
	TOTAL	55	100.0	100.0	
Mean	3.241	Std Dev	.950	Minimum	2.000
Maximum	5.000				
Valid Cases	54	Missing Cases	1		

Q60 NCOS KNOW AND ABIL TO TRAIN

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
STRONGLY AGREE	1	5	9.1	9.1	9.1
AGREE	2	27	49.1	49.1	58.2
NEUTRAL	3	11	20.0	20.0	78.2
DISAGREE	4	10	18.2	18.2	96.4
STRONGLY DISAGREE	5	2	3.6	3.6	100.0
		-----	-----	-----	
	TOTAL	55	100.0	100.0	
Mean	2.582	Std Dev	1.013	Minimum	1.000
Maximum	5.000				
Valid Cases	55	Missing Cases	0		

Part IV - Commanders of CSS Battalions (Cont)

Q61 JR OFF SKILL AND KNOW TO TRAIN

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
STRONGLY AGREE	1	5	9.1	9.1	9.1
AGREE	2	32	58.2	58.2	67.3
NEUTRAL	3	12	21.8	21.8	89.1
DISAGREE	4	5	9.1	9.1	98.2
STRONGLY DISAGREE	5	1	1.8	1.8	100.0
		-----	-----	-----	
	TOTAL	55	100.0	100.0	
Mean	2.364	Std Dev	.847	Minimum	1.000
Maximum	5.000				

Valid Cases 55 Missing Cases 0

Q62 JR OFF GROUNDED IN UNIT DOCTRINE

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
AGREE	2	24	43.6	43.6	43.6
NEUTRAL	3	12	21.8	21.8	65.5
DISAGREE	4	18	32.7	32.7	98.2
STRONGLY DISAGREE	5	1	1.8	1.8	100.0
		-----	-----	-----	
	TOTAL	55	100.0	100.0	
Mean	2.927	Std Dev	.920	Minimum	2.000
Maximum	5.000				

Valid Cases 55 Missing Cases 0

Part IV - Commanders of CSS Battalions (Cont)

Q63 LEAVENWORTH PCC ADEQUATE

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
STRONGLY AGREE	1	4	7.3	7.3	7.3
AGREE	2	31	56.4	56.4	63.6
NEUTRAL	3	14	25.5	25.5	89.1
DISAGREE	4	3	5.5	5.5	94.5
STRONGLY DISAGREE	5	3	5.5	5.5	100.0
		-----	-----	-----	
	TOTAL	55	100.0	100.0	
Mean	2.455	Std Dev	.919	Minimum	1.000
Maximum	5.000				

Valid Cases 55 Missing Cases 0

Q64 BRANCH PCC ADEQUATE

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
STRONGLY AGREE	1	2	3.6	3.7	3.7
AGREE	2	18	32.7	33.3	37.0
NEUTRAL	3	15	27.3	27.8	64.8
DISAGREE	4	12	21.8	22.2	87.0
STRONGLY DISAGREE	5	7	12.7	13.0	100.0
	.	1	1.8	MISSING	
		-----	-----	-----	
	TOTAL	55	100.0	100.0	
Mean	3.074	Std Dev	1.113	Minimum	1.000
Maximum	5.000				

Valid Cases 54 Missing Cases 1

Part IV - Commanders of CSS Battalions (Cont)

Q65 JR SOLDIERS BETTER EDUCATED THAN NCOS

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
STRONGLY AGREE	1	4	7.3	7.3	7.3
AGREE	2	20	36.4	36.4	43.6
NEUTRAL	3	16	29.1	29.1	72.7
DISAGREE	4	15	27.3	27.3	100.0
		-----	-----	-----	
	TOTAL	55	100.0	100.0	
Mean	2.764	Std Dev	.942	Minimum	1.000
Maximum	4.000				
Valid Cases	55	Missing Cases	0		

Q66 OFF UNDERSTOOD ORG STRUC AND RELTN

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
STRONGLY AGREE	1	3	5.5	5.6	5.6
AGREE	2	39	70.9	72.2	77.8
NEUTRAL	3	4	7.3	7.4	85.2
DISAGREE	4	8	14.5	14.8	100.0
	.	1	1.8	MISSING	
		-----	-----	-----	
	TOTAL	55	100.0	100.0	
Mean	2.315	Std Dev	.797	Minimum	1.000
Maximum	4.000				
Valid Cases	54	Missing Cases	1		

Part IV - Commandres of CSS Battalions (Cont)

Q67 POST COMMAND CLIMATE SATISFACTORY

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
STRONGLY AGREE	1	24	43.6	43.6	43.6
AGREE	2	24	43.6	43.6	87.3
NEUTRAL	3	2	3.6	3.6	90.9
DISAGREE	4	4	7.3	7.3	98.2
STRONGLY DISAGREE	5	1	1.8	1.8	100.0
		-----	-----	-----	
	TOTAL	55	100.0	100.0	
Mean	1.800	Std Dev	.951	Minimum	1.000
Maximum	5.000				

Valid Cases 55 Missing Cases 0

Q68 CHAIN OF COMMAND VALUES MATCHED YOURS

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
STRONGLY AGREE	1	19	34.5	34.5	34.5
AGREE	2	28	50.9	50.9	85.5
NEUTRAL	3	3	5.5	5.5	90.9
DISAGREE	4	5	9.1	9.1	100.0
		-----	-----	-----	
	TOTAL	55	100.0	100.0	
Mean	1.891	Std Dev	.875	Minimum	1.000
Maximum	4.000				

Valid Cases 55 Missing Cases 0



Part IV - Commanders of CSS Battalions (Cont)

Q69 COC SUPPORTED ACCURATE REPORTING

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
STRONGLY AGREE	1	27	49.1	49.1	49.1
AGREE	2	27	49.1	49.1	98.2
	6	1	1.8	1.8	100.0
		-----	-----	-----	
	TOTAL	55	100.0	100.0	

Mean 1.582 Std Dev .786 Minimum 1.000  
Maximum 6.000

Valid Cases 55 Missing Cases 0

Q70 ACCURATE ASSESSMENTS AND REPORTS UP

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
STRONGLY AGREE	1	10	18.2	18.2	18.2
AGREE	2	42	76.4	76.4	94.5
NEUTRAL	3	3	5.5	5.5	100.0
		-----	-----	-----	
	TOTAL	55	100.0	100.0	

Mean 1.873 Std Dev .474 Minimum 1.000  
Maximum 3.000

Valid Cases 55 Missing Cases 0

Q71 NCO MORAL AND ETHICAL STDS SAT

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
STRONGLY AGREE	1	6	10.9	11.1	11.1
AGREE	2	31	56.4	57.4	68.5
NEUTRAL	3	10	18.2	18.5	87.0
DISAGREE	4	7	12.7	13.0	100.0
	.	1	1.8	MISSING	
		-----	-----	-----	
	TOTAL	55	100.0	100.0	

Mean 2.333 Std Dev .847 Minimum 1.000  
Maximum 4.000

Valid Cases 54 Missing Cases 1

Part IV - Commanders of CSS Battalions (Cont)

Q72 OFF MORAL AND ETHICAL STDS SAT

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
STRONGLY AGREE	1	12	21.8	21.8	21.8
AGREE	2	39	70.9	70.9	92.7
NEUTRAL	3	1	1.8	1.8	94.5
DISAGREE	4	3	5.5	5.5	100.0
TOTAL		55	100.0	100.0	
Mean	1.909	Std Dev	.674	Minimum	1.000
Maximum	4.000				
Valid Cases	55	Missing Cases	0		

Q73 DRUG/ALCOHOL PROBLEM FOR JR EM

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
AGREE	2	9	16.4	16.4	16.4
NEUTRAL	3	8	14.5	14.5	30.9
DISAGREE	4	30	54.5	54.5	85.5
STRONGLY DISAGREE	5	8	14.5	14.5	100.0
TOTAL		55	100.0	100.0	
Mean	3.673	Std Dev	.924	Minimum	2.000
Maximum	5.000				
Valid Cases	55	Missing Cases	0		

Q74 DRUG/ALCOHOL PROBLEM FOR NCOS

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
AGREE	2	9	16.4	16.4	16.4
NEUTRAL	3	11	20.0	20.0	36.4
DISAGREE	4	25	45.5	45.5	81.8
STRONGLY DISAGREE	5	10	18.2	18.2	100.0
TOTAL		55	100.0	100.0	
Mean	3.655	Std Dev	.966	Minimum	2.000
Maximum	5.000				
Valid Cases	55	Missing Cases	0		

Part IV - Commanders of CSS Battalions (Cont)

Q75 DRUG/ALCOHOL PROBLEM FOR OFF

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
NEUTRAL	3	4	7.3	7.3	7.3
DISAGREE	4	26	47.3	47.3	54.5
STRONGLY DISAGREE	5	25	45.5	45.5	100.0
		-----	-----	-----	
	TOTAL	55	100.0	100.0	

Mean 4.382 Std Dev .623 Minimum 3.000  
Maximum 5.000

Valid Cases 55 Missing Cases 0

Q79 UCMJ ACTIONS PER MONTH

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
0-5	1	39	70.9	76.5	76.5
6-10	2	10	18.2	19.6	96.1
11-15	3	2	3.6	3.9	100.0
	.	4	7.3	MISSING	
		-----	-----	-----	
	TOTAL	55	100.0	100.0	

Mean 1.275 Std Dev .532 Minimum 1.000  
Maximum 3.000

Valid Cases 51 Missing Cases 4

Q81 FREQ MENTORED BY CDR

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
DAILY	1	1	1.8	1.8	1.8
WEEKLY	2	14	25.5	25.5	27.3
MONTHLY	3	10	18.2	18.2	45.5
QUARTERLY	4	10	18.2	18.2	63.6
ANNUALLY	5	5	9.1	9.1	72.7
AT OER TIME	6	6	10.9	10.9	83.6
NEVER	7	9	16.4	16.4	100.0
		-----	-----	-----	
	TOTAL	55	100.0	100.0	

Mean 4.055 Std Dev 1.850 Minimum 1.000  
Maximum 7.000

Valid Cases 55 Missing Cases 0

Part IV - Commanders of CSS Battalions (Cont)

Q82      FREQ COUNSELED SUBORDINATES

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
DAILY	1	5	9.1	9.1	9.1
WEEKLY	2	8	14.5	14.5	23.6
MONTHLY	3	20	36.4	36.4	60.0
QUARTERLY	4	20	36.4	36.4	96.4
ANNUALLY	5	2	3.6	3.6	100.0
		-----	-----	-----	
	TOTAL	55	100.0	100.0	
Mean	3.109	Std Dev	1.012	Minimum	1.000
Maximum	5.000				

Valid Cases      55      Missing Cases      0

Q83      FREQ POSITIVE WRITTEN COUNSELING

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
WEEKLY	2	1	1.8	1.8	1.8
MONTHLY	3	11	20.0	20.0	21.8
QUARTERLY	4	23	41.8	41.8	63.6
ANNUALLY	5	7	12.7	12.7	76.4
AT OER TIME	6	8	14.5	14.5	90.9
NEVER	7	5	9.1	9.1	100.0
		-----	-----	-----	
	TOTAL	55	100.0	100.0	
Mean	4.455	Std Dev	1.274	Minimum	2.000
Maximum	7.000				

Valid Cases      55      Missing Cases      0

Part IV - Commanders of CSS Battalions (Cont)

Q84 YOUR FREEDOM TO COMMAND

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
MODERATE	2	8	14.5	14.5	14.5
HIGH	3	47	85.5	85.5	100.0
		-----	-----	-----	
	TOTAL	55	100.0	100.0	
Mean	2.855	Std Dev	.356	Minimum	2.000
Maximum	3.000				
Valid Cases	55	Missing Cases	0		

Q85 YOUR SUBORDINATES FREEDOM TO CMD

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
LOW	1	1	1.8	1.9	1.9
MODERATE	2	22	40.0	40.7	42.6
HIGH	3	31	56.4	57.4	100.0
	.	1	1.8	MISSING	
		-----	-----	-----	
	TOTAL	55	100.0	100.0	
Mean	2.556	Std Dev	.538	Minimum	1.000
Maximum	3.000				
Valid Cases	54	Missing Cases	1		

Q86 IMPORTANCE OF STATISTICS

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
NO IMPORTANCE	1	2	3.6	3.6	3.6
NOT ENOUGH	2	1	1.8	1.8	5.5
ABOUT RIGHT	3	34	61.8	61.8	67.3
A LITTLE TOO MUCH	4	12	21.8	21.8	89.1
ENTIRELY TOO MUCH	5	6	10.9	10.9	100.0
		-----	-----	-----	
	TOTAL	55	100.0	100.0	
Mean	3.345	Std Dev	.844	Minimum	1.000
Maximum	5.000				
Valid Cases	55	Missing Cases	0		

Part IV - Commanders of CSS Battalions (Cont)

Q87 YOUR SENIOR RATER PROFILE KNOWN

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
YES	1	48	87.3	87.3	87.3
NO	2	7	12.7	12.7	100.0
		-----	-----	-----	
	TOTAL	55	100.0	100.0	
Mean	1.127	Std Dev	.336	Minimum	1.000
Maximum	2.000				
Valid Cases	55	Missing Cases	0		

Q88 DISCUSS RATINGS WITH SUBORDINATES

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
YES	1	53	96.4	96.4	96.4
NO	2	2	3.6	3.6	100.0
		-----	-----	-----	
	TOTAL	55	100.0	100.0	
Mean	1.036	Std Dev	.189	Minimum	1.000
Maximum	2.000				
Valid Cases	55	Missing Cases	0		

Q89 YOUR SENIOR RATER'S PROFILE KNOWN

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
YES	1	27	49.1	49.1	49.1
NO	2	28	50.9	50.9	100.0
		-----	-----	-----	
	TOTAL	55	100.0	100.0	
Mean	1.509	Std Dev	.505	Minimum	1.000
Maximum	2.000				
Valid Cases	55	Missing Cases	0		

Part IV - Commanders of CSS Battalions (Cont)

Q90 RATER DISCUSSED YOUR REPORT PRIOR

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
YES	1	35	63.6	63.6	63.6
NO	2	20	36.4	36.4	100.0
		-----	-----	-----	
	TOTAL	55	100.0	100.0	
Mean	1.364	Std Dev	.485	Minimum	1.000
Maximum	2.000				
Valid Cases	55	Missing Cases	0		

Q91 SR RTR DISCUSSED YOUR REPORT PRIOR

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
YES	1	11	20.0	20.0	20.0
NO	2	43	78.2	78.2	98.2
	3	1	1.8	1.8	100.0
		-----	-----	-----	
	TOTAL	55	100.0	100.0	
Mean	1.818	Std Dev	.434	Minimum	1.000
Maximum	3.000				
Valid Cases	55	Missing Cases	0		

Q92 SUPPORT FROM HIGHER HEADQUARTERS

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
VERY DISSATISFIED	1	2	3.6	3.6	3.6
DISSATISFIED	2	4	7.3	7.3	10.9
BORDERLINE	3	8	14.5	14.5	25.5
SATISFIED	4	31	56.4	56.4	81.8
VERY SATISFIED	5	10	18.2	18.2	100.0
		-----	-----	-----	
	TOTAL	55	100.0	100.0	
Mean	3.782	Std Dev	.956	Minimum	1.000
Maximum	5.000				
Valid Cases	55	Missing Cases	0		

Part IV -- Commanders of CSS Battalions (Cont)

Q93 HIGHER CDRS KNEW YOUR UNIT STATUS

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
VERY DISSATISFIED	1	2	3.6	3.6	3.6
DISSATISFIED	2	2	3.6	3.6	7.3
BORDERLINE	3	6	10.9	10.9	18.2
SATISFIED	4	31	56.4	56.4	74.5
VERY SATISFIED	5	14	25.5	25.5	100.0
		-----	-----	-----	
	TOTAL	55	100.0	100.0	
Mean	3.964	Std Dev	.922	Minimum	1.000
Maximum	5.000				

Valid Cases 55 Missing Cases 0

Q94 FREQ OF IMMEDIATE CDR VISITS

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
WEEKLY	2	8	14.5	14.5	14.5
MONTHLY	3	25	45.5	45.5	60.0
QUARTERLY	4	13	23.6	23.6	83.6
SEMI-ANNUALLY	5	7	12.7	12.7	96.4
ANNUALLY	6	1	1.8	1.8	98.2
LESS THAN ANNUALLY	7	1	1.8	1.8	100.0
		-----	-----	-----	
	TOTAL	55	100.0	100.0	
Mean	3.473	Std Dev	1.069	Minimum	2.000
Maximum	7.000				

Valid Cases 55 Missing Cases 0



Part IV - Commanders of CSS Battalions (Cont)

Q95 SENIOR CDRS WOULD SPT IN HARD TIMES

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
STRONGLY AGREE	1	19	34.5	34.5	34.5
AGREE	2	27	49.1	49.1	83.6
NEUTRAL	3	3	5.5	5.5	89.1
DISAGREE	4	2	3.6	3.6	92.7
STRONGLY DISAGREE	5	4	7.3	7.3	100.0
		-----	-----	-----	
	TOTAL	55	100.0	100.0	
Mean	2.000	Std Dev	1.106	Minimum	1.000
Maximum	5.000				
Valid Cases	55	Missing Cases	0		

Q96 SAT CMD CLIMATE FROM HIGHER HQ

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
STRONGLY AGREE	1	16	29.1	29.1	29.1
AGREE	2	27	49.1	49.1	78.2
NEUTRAL	3	4	7.3	7.3	85.5
DISAGREE	4	4	7.3	7.3	92.7
STRONGLY DISAGREE	5	4	7.3	7.3	100.0
		-----	-----	-----	
	TOTAL	55	100.0	100.0	
Mean	2.145	Std Dev	1.145	Minimum	1.000
Maximum	5.000				
Valid Cases	55	Missing Cases	0		

Q97 CHAIN OF CMD FAIR TO COMMANDERS

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
YES	1	50	90.9	90.9	90.9
NO	2	5	9.1	9.1	100.0
		-----	-----	-----	
	TOTAL	55	100.0	100.0	
Mean	1.091	Std Dev	.290	Minimum	1.000
Maximum	2.000				
Valid Cases	55	Missing Cases	0		

Part IV - Commanders of CSS Battalions (Cont)

Q98 HOW POSITIVE ABOUT ARMY CAREER

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
MUCH MORE POSITIVELY	1	12	21.8	21.8	21.8
MORE POSITIVELY	2	16	29.1	29.1	50.9
ABOUT THE SAME	3	18	32.7	32.7	83.6
LESS POSITIVELY	4	6	10.9	10.9	94.5
MUCH LESS POSITIVELY	5	3	5.5	5.5	100.0
		-----	-----	-----	
	TOTAL	55	100.0	100.0	
Mean	2.491	Std Dev	1.120	Minimum	1.000
Maximum	5.000				
Valid Cases	55	Missing Cases	0		

Part V - Results for Commanders of Other Units

Q11 ACCOMPANIED TOUR

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
YES WITH SPOUSE	1	21	100.0	100.0	100.0
		-----	-----	-----	
	TOTAL	21	100.0	100.0	
Mean	1.000	Std Dev	0.0	Minimum	1.000
Maximum	1.000				

Valid Cases 21 Missing Cases 0

Q12 LIVED ON POST

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
YES	1	13	61.9	61.9	61.9
NO	2	8	38.1	38.1	100.0
		-----	-----	-----	
	TOTAL	21	100.0	100.0	
Mean	1.381	Std Dev	.498	Minimum	1.000
Maximum	2.000				

Valid Cases 21 Missing Cases 0

Q13 SPOUSE PARTICIPATION

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
ALMOST NEVER	1	1	4.8	4.8	4.8
SELDOM	2	1	4.8	4.8	9.5
SOMETIMES	3	6	28.6	28.6	38.1
FREQUENTLY	4	7	33.3	33.3	71.4
ALMOST ALWAYS	5	6	28.6	28.6	100.0
		-----	-----	-----	
	TOTAL	21	100.0	100.0	
Mean	3.762	Std Dev	1.091	Minimum	1.000
Maximum	5.000				

Valid Cases 21 Missing Cases 0

Part V - Commanders of Other Units (Cont)

Q14 SPOUSE EMPLOYMENT

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
FULL TIME	1	4	19.0	19.0	19.0
PART TIME	2	11	52.4	52.4	71.4
NOT OUTSIDE HOME	3	6	28.6	28.6	100.0
		-----	-----	-----	
	TOTAL	21	100.0	100.0	
Mean	2.095	Std Dev	.700	Minimum	1.000
Maximum	3.000				
Valid Cases	21	Missing Cases	0		

Q15 DIRECT INPUT IN DEVELOPING COB

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
YES	1	9	42.9	42.9	42.9
SOMETIMES	2	4	19.0	19.0	61.9
NO	3	8	38.1	38.1	100.0
		-----	-----	-----	
	TOTAL	21	100.0	100.0	
Mean	1.952	Std Dev	.921	Minimum	1.000
Maximum	3.000				
Valid Cases	21	Missing Cases	0		

Q16 PERCENT TIME ON BUDGET MANAGEMENT

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
\$10%	1	13	61.9	61.9	61.9
11-20%	2	5	23.8	23.8	85.7
21-30%	3	2	9.5	9.5	95.2
41-50%	5	1	4.8	4.8	100.0
		-----	-----	-----	
	TOTAL	21	100.0	100.0	
Mean	1.619	Std Dev	1.024	Minimum	1.000
Maximum	5.000				
Valid Cases	21	Missing Cases	0		

Part V - Commanders of Other Units (Cont)

Q17 ENOUGH AMMUNITION FOR STRAC

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
YES	1	7	33.3	33.3	33.3
NO	2	1	4.8	4.8	38.1
NA	3	13	61.9	61.9	100.0
		-----	-----	-----	
TOTAL		21	100.0	100.0	
Mean	2.286	Std Dev	.956	Minimum	1.000
Maximum	3.000				
Valid Cases	21	Missing Cases	0		

Q18 SUFFICIENT TRAINING FUNDS

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
SOMETIMES	3	2	9.5	9.5	9.5
FREQUENTLY	4	7	33.3	33.3	42.9
ALMOST ALWAYS	5	12	57.1	57.1	100.0
		-----	-----	-----	
TOTAL		21	100.0	100.0	
Mean	4.476	Std Dev	.680	Minimum	3.000
Maximum	5.000				
Valid Cases	21	Missing Cases	0		

Q19 AVERAGE PERSONNEL TURNOVER RATE

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
\$10%	1	7	33.3	33.3	33.3
11-15%	2	5	23.8	23.8	57.1
16-20%	3	3	14.3	14.3	71.4
21-25%	4	3	14.3	14.3	85.7
26-30%	5	2	9.5	9.5	95.2
\$30%	6	1	4.8	4.8	100.0
		-----	-----	-----	
TOTAL		21	100.0	100.0	
Mean	2.571	Std Dev	1.568	Minimum	1.000
Maximum	6.000				
Valid Cases	21	Missing Cases	0		

Part V - Commanders of Other Units (Cont)

Q20 AVAILABILITY OF TRAINING RESOURCES

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
SOMETIMES	3	4	19.0	20.0	20.0
FREQUENTLY	4	5	23.8	25.0	45.0
ALMOST ALWAYS	5	11	52.4	55.0	100.0
.	.	1	4.8	MISSING	
		-----	-----	-----	
	TOTAL	21	100.0	100.0	
Mean	4.350	Std Dev	.813	Minimum	3.000
Maximum	5.000				
Valid Cases	20	Missing Cases	1		

Q21 UFRS INHIBITED TRAINING

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
ALMOST NEVER	1	10	47.6	47.6	47.6
SELDOM	2	6	28.6	28.6	76.2
SOMETIMES	3	5	23.8	23.8	100.0
		-----	-----	-----	
	TOTAL	21	100.0	100.0	
Mean	1.762	Std Dev	.831	Minimum	1.000
Maximum	3.000				
Valid Cases	21	Missing Cases	0		

Q22 ALO

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
2	2	3	14.3	14.3	14.3
NA	4	18	85.7	85.7	100.0
		-----	-----	-----	
	TOTAL	21	100.0	100.0	
Mean	3.714	Std Dev	.717	Minimum	2.000
Maximum	4.000				
Valid Cases	21	Missing Cases	0		

Part V - Commanders of Other Units (Cont)

Q23 CRITICAL RESOURCES SHARED

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
DONT KNOW	1	3	14.3	14.3	14.3
SLIGHTLY	3	9	42.9	42.9	57.1
MODERATELY	4	6	28.6	28.6	85.7
GREATLY	5	3	14.3	14.3	100.0
		-----	-----	-----	
	TOTAL	21	100.0	100.0	
Mean	3.286	Std Dev	1.189	Minimum	1.000
Maximum	5.000				
Valid Cases	21	Missing Cases	0		

Q24 CRITICAL RESOURCES CROSSLEVELED

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
NOT AT ALL	2	1	4.8	4.8	4.8
SLIGHTLY	3	11	52.4	52.4	57.1
MODERATELY	4	6	28.6	28.6	85.7
GREATLY	5	3	14.3	14.3	100.0
		-----	-----	-----	
	TOTAL	21	100.0	100.0	
Mean	3.524	Std Dev	.814	Minimum	2.000
Maximum	5.000				
Valid Cases	21	Missing Cases	0		

Q25 OTHER UNITS WITH HIGHER PRIORITY

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
YES	1	8	38.1	38.1	38.1
NO	2	13	61.9	61.9	100.0
		-----	-----	-----	
	TOTAL	21	100.0	100.0	
Mean	1.619	Std Dev	.498	Minimum	1.000
Maximum	2.000				
Valid Cases	21	Missing Cases	0		

Part V - Commanders of Other Units (Cont)

Q26 FACILITY AVAIL DEGRADED TRAINING

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
NOT AT ALL	2	10	47.6	47.6	47.6
SLIGHTLY	3	8	38.1	38.1	85.7
MODERATELY	4	3	14.3	14.3	100.0
		-----	-----	-----	
	TOTAL	21	100.0	100.0	

Mean 2.667 Std Dev .730 Minimum 2.000  
Maximum 4.000

Valid Cases 21 Missing Cases 0

Q27 MOS SHORTAGES DEGRADED EFFECTIVENESS

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
NOT AT ALL	2	8	38.1	40.0	40.0
SLIGHTLY	3	10	47.6	50.0	90.0
MODERATELY	4	2	9.5	10.0	100.0
	.	1	4.8	MISSING	
		-----	-----	-----	
	TOTAL	21	100.0	100.0	

Mean 2.700 Std Dev .657 Minimum 2.000  
Maximum 4.000

Valid Cases 20 Missing Cases 1

Q28 TOTAL COB

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
\$S1 M	1	11	52.4	55.0	55.0
\$1-5 M	2	5	23.8	25.0	80.0
\$6-10 M	3	2	9.5	10.0	90.0
¶\$10 M	4	2	9.5	10.0	100.0
	.	1	4.8	MISSING	
		-----	-----	-----	
	TOTAL	21	100.0	100.0	

Mean 1.750 Std Dev 1.020 Minimum 1.000  
Maximum 4.000

Valid Cases 20 Missing Cases 1



Part V - Commanders of Other Units (Cont)

Q29 ALO CONSTRAINED READINESS

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
AGREE	2	3	14.3	15.8	15.8
NEUTRAL	3	14	66.7	73.7	89.5
DISAGREE	4	1	4.8	5.3	94.7
STRONGLY DISAGREE	5	1	4.8	5.3	100.0
.	.	2	9.5	MISSING	
TOTAL		21	100.0	100.0	
Mean	3.000	Std Dev	.667	Minimum	2.000
Maximum	5.000				
Valid Cases	19	Missing Cases	2		

Q30 REPAIR PARTS REQUISITIONS DEFERRED

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
ALMOST NEVER	1	12	57.1	60.0	60.0
SELDOM	2	3	14.3	15.0	75.0
SOMETIMES	3	4	19.0	20.0	95.0
FREQUENTLY	4	1	4.8	5.0	100.0
.	.	1	4.8	MISSING	
TOTAL		21	100.0	100.0	
Mean	1.700	Std Dev	.979	Minimum	1.000
Maximum	4.000				
Valid Cases	20	Missing Cases	1		

Q31 BASIS FOR BUDGET

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
PROJECTED EVENTS	1	13	61.9	61.9	61.9
PRIOR EXPENDITURES	2	5	23.8	23.8	85.7
OTHER	3	3	14.3	14.3	100.0
TOTAL		21	100.0	100.0	
Mean	1.524	Std Dev	.750	Minimum	1.000
Maximum	3.000				
Valid Cases	21	Missing Cases	0		

Part V - Commanders of Other Units (Cont)

Q32 SUFFICIENT RESOURCES FOR TRAINING

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
ALL I DESIRED	1	9	42.9	42.9	42.9
MOST I DESIRED	2	8	38.1	38.1	81.0
ONLY REQUIRED	3	2	9.5	9.5	90.5
LESS THAN REQUIRED	4	2	9.5	9.5	100.0
		-----	-----	-----	
	TOTAL	21	100.0	100.0	
Mean	1.857	Std Dev	.964	Minimum	1.000
Maximum	4.000				

Valid Cases 21 Missing Cases 0

Q33 TRAINING DEVELOPMENT BASED ON 25 SERIES

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
STRONGLY AGREE	1	7	33.3	35.0	35.0
AGREE	2	7	33.3	35.0	70.0
NEUTRAL	3	4	19.0	20.0	90.0
DISAGREE	4	1	4.8	5.0	95.0
STRONGLY DISAGREE	5	1	4.8	5.0	100.0
	.	1	4.8	MISSING	
		-----	-----	-----	
	TOTAL	21	100.0	100.0	
Mean	2.100	Std Dev	1.119	Minimum	1.000
Maximum	5.000				

Valid Cases 20 Missing Cases 1

Part V - Commanders of Other Units (Cont)

Q34 CLEAR TRNG GUIDANCE FROM SENIOR HQ

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
STRONGLY AGREE	1	10	47.6	47.6	47.6
AGREE	2	5	23.8	23.8	71.4
NEUTRAL	3	4	19.0	19.0	90.5
DISAGREE	4	2	9.5	9.5	100.0
		-----	-----	-----	
	TOTAL	21	100.0	100.0	
Mean	1.905	Std Dev	1.044	Minimum	1.000
Maximum	4.000				

Valid Cases 21 Missing Cases 0

Q35 TRNG GUIDANCE SUPPORTED TOUGH TRNG

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
STRONGLY AGREE	1	8	38.1	38.1	38.1
AGREE	2	6	28.6	28.6	66.7
NEUTRAL	3	5	23.8	23.8	90.5
DISAGREE	4	1	4.8	4.8	95.2
STRONGLY DISAGREE	5	1	4.8	4.8	100.0
		-----	-----	-----	
	TOTAL	21	100.0	100.0	
Mean	2.095	Std Dev	1.136	Minimum	1.000
Maximum	5.000				

Valid Cases 21 Missing Cases 0

Part V - Commanders of Other Units (Cont)

Q36 SAME TRNG AREAS DEGRADED TRNG

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
STRONGLY AGREE	1	1	4.8	5.0	5.0
AGREE	2	2	9.5	10.0	15.0
NEUTRAL	3	8	38.1	40.0	55.0
DISAGREE	4	8	38.1	40.0	95.0
STRONGLY DISAGREE	5	1	4.8	5.0	100.0
.	.	1	4.8	MISSING	
		-----	-----	-----	
	TOTAL	21	100.0	100.0	

Mean 3.300 Std Dev .923 Minimum 1.000  
Maximum 5.000

Valid Cases 20 Missing Cases 1

Q37 FREQUENCY OF OFF POST TRNG

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
ALMOST NEVER	1	7	33.3	33.3	33.3
SELDOM	2	5	23.8	23.8	57.1
SOMETIMES	3	5	23.8	23.8	81.0
FREQUENTLY	4	2	9.5	9.5	90.5
ALMOST ALWAYS	5	2	9.5	9.5	100.0
		-----	-----	-----	
	TOTAL	21	100.0	100.0	

Mean 2.381 Std Dev 1.322 Minimum 1.000  
Maximum 5.000

Valid Cases 21 Missing Cases 0

Part V - Commanders of Other Units (Cont)

Q38 TRNG BASED ON MTPS

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
STRONGLY AGREE	1	5	23.8	25.0	25.0
AGREE	2	5	23.8	25.0	50.0
NEUTRAL	3	7	33.3	35.0	85.0
DISAGREE	4	3	14.3	15.0	100.0
.	.	1	4.8	MISSING	
		-----	-----	-----	
	TOTAL	21	100.0	100.0	
Mean	2.400	Std Dev	1.046	Minimum	1.000
Maximum	4.000				
Valid Cases	20	Missing Cases	1		

Q39 MTPS PROVIDED BASIS FOR TOUGH TRNG

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
STRONGLY AGREE	1	4	19.0	21.1	21.1
AGREE	2	11	52.4	57.9	78.9
NEUTRAL	3	4	19.0	21.1	100.0
.	.	2	9.5	MISSING	
		-----	-----	-----	
	TOTAL	21	100.0	100.0	
Mean	2.000	Std Dev	.667	Minimum	1.000
Maximum	3.000				
Valid Cases	19	Missing Cases	2		

Q41 HIGHER HQ CHANGES HINDERED TRNG

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
ALMOST NEVER	1	6	28.6	28.6	28.6
SELDOM	2	6	28.6	28.6	57.1
SOMETIMES	3	7	33.3	33.3	90.5
FREQUENTLY	4	2	9.5	9.5	100.0
		-----	-----	-----	
	TOTAL	21	100.0	100.0	
Mean	2.238	Std Dev	.995	Minimum	1.000
Maximum	4.000				
Valid Cases	21	Missing Cases	0		

Part V - Commanders of Other Units (Cont)

Q42 HIGHER HQ DIRECTIVES ENHANCED TRNG

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
STRONGLY AGREE	1	1	4.8	4.8	4.8
AGREE	2	7	33.3	33.3	38.1
NEUTRAL	3	12	57.1	57.1	95.2
DISAGREE	4	1	4.8	4.8	100.0
		-----	-----	-----	
	TOTAL	21	100.0	100.0	

Mean 2.619 Std Dev .669 Minimum 1.000  
Maximum 4.000

Valid Cases 21 Missing Cases 0

Q43 TRNG INCLUDED COMBINED ARMS AND SLICE

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
ALMOST NEVER	1	12	57.1	66.7	66.7
SELDOM	2	1	4.8	5.6	72.2
SOMETIMES	3	4	19.0	22.2	94.4
FREQUENTLY	4	1	4.8	5.6	100.0
	.	3	14.3	MISSING	
		-----	-----	-----	
	TOTAL	21	100.0	100.0	

Mean 1.667 Std Dev 1.029 Minimum 1.000  
Maximum 4.000

Valid Cases 18 Missing Cases 3

Part V - Commanders of Other Units (Cont)

Q44 TRNG WAS JOINT

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
ALMOST NEVER	1	10	47.6	47.6	47.6
SELDOM	2	2	9.5	9.5	57.1
SOMETIMES	3	3	14.3	14.3	71.4
FREQUENTLY	4	3	14.3	14.3	85.7
ALMOST ALWAYS	5	2	9.5	9.5	95.2
	6	1	4.8	4.8	100.0
		-----	-----	-----	
	TOTAL	21	100.0	100.0	
Mean	2.429	Std Dev	1.660	Minimum	1.000
Maximum	6.000				

Valid Cases 21 Missing Cases 0

Q45 NCOS ABILITY TO PLAN AND CONDUCT TRNG

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
STRONGLY AGREE	1	6	28.6	31.6	31.6
AGREE	2	9	42.9	47.4	78.9
NEUTRAL	3	4	19.0	21.1	100.0
	.	2	9.5	MISSING	
		-----	-----	-----	
	TOTAL	21	100.0	100.0	
Mean	1.895	Std Dev	.737	Minimum	1.000
Maximum	3.000				

Valid Cases 19 Missing Cases 2

Part V - Commanders of Other Units (Cont)

Q46 OK TO TRNSFR INDIV TRNG FROM AIT TO UNIT

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
STRONGLY AGREE	1	1	4.8	5.3	5.3
AGREE	2	1	4.8	5.3	10.5
NEUTRAL	3	12	57.1	63.2	73.7
DISAGREE	4	2	9.5	10.5	84.2
STRONGLY DISAGREE	5	3	14.3	15.8	100.0
.	.	2	9.5	MISSING	
		-----	-----	-----	
	TOTAL	21	100.0	100.0	

Mean 3.263 Std Dev .991 Minimum 1.000  
Maximum 5.000

Valid Cases 19 Missing Cases 2

Q47 BNCOC/ANCOC IMPROVED CAPABILITY TO TRN

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
STRONGLY AGREE	1	9	42.9	45.0	45.0
AGREE	2	10	47.6	50.0	95.0
NEUTRAL	3	1	4.8	5.0	100.0
.	.	1	4.8	MISSING	
		-----	-----	-----	
	TOTAL	21	100.0	100.0	

Mean 1.600 Std Dev .598 Minimum 1.000  
Maximum 3.000

Valid Cases 20 Missing Cases 1

Q48 JR OFF ABLE TO PLAN, CONDUCT TRNG

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
STRONGLY AGREE	1	4	19.0	21.1	21.1
AGREE	2	10	47.6	52.6	73.7
NEUTRAL	3	5	23.8	26.3	100.0
.	.	2	9.5	MISSING	
		-----	-----	-----	
	TOTAL	21	100.0	100.0	

Mean 2.053 Std Dev .705 Minimum 1.000  
Maximum 3.000

Valid Cases 19 Missing Cases 2



Part V - Commander of Other Units (Cont)

Q49 SCENARIOS AT CTC SUPPORTED ALB

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
STRONGLY AGREE	1	1	4.8	5.9	5.9
AGREE	2	3	14.3	17.6	23.5
NEUTRAL	3	13	61.9	76.5	100.0
.	4	4	19.0	MISSING	
		-----	-----	-----	
TOTAL		21	100.0	100.0	
Mean	2.706	Std Dev	.588	Minimum	1.000
Maximum	3.000				
Valid Cases	17	Missing Cases	4		

Q50 CTC PERFORMANCE ON OER

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
YES, EXPLICITLY	1	1	4.8	7.7	7.7
NO	3	7	33.3	53.8	61.5
DONT KNOW	4	5	23.8	38.5	100.0
.		8	38.1	MISSING	
		-----	-----	-----	
TOTAL		21	100.0	100.0	
Mean	3.231	Std Dev	.832	Minimum	1.000
Maximum	4.000				
Valid Cases	13	Missing Cases	8		

Q51 NUMBER OF CTC ROTATIONS

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
NONE	1	7	33.3	36.8	36.8
1	2	1	4.8	5.3	42.1
NA	6	11	52.4	57.9	100.0
.		2	9.5	MISSING	
		-----	-----	-----	
TOTAL		21	100.0	100.0	
Mean	3.947	Std Dev	2.483	Minimum	1.000
Maximum	6.000				
Valid Cases	19	Missing Cases	2		

Part V - Commanders of Other Units (Cont)

Q52 FREQUENCY OF QTBS

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
NEVER	1	9	42.9	45.0	45.0
ANNUALLY	2	3	14.3	15.0	60.0
SEMI-ANNUALLY	3	1	4.8	5.0	65.0
QUARTERLY	4	5	23.8	25.0	90.0
MORE THAN QUARTERLY	5	1	4.8	5.0	95.0
	6	1	4.8	5.0	100.0
	.	1	4.8	MISSING	
		-----	-----	-----	
	TOTAL	21	100.0	100.0	
Mean	2.450	Std Dev	1.638	Minimum	1.000
Maximum	6.000				

Valid Cases 20 Missing Cases 1

-----

Q53 ATTAIN STDS FOR INDIV MARKSMENSHIP

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
NEVER	1	2	9.5	10.0	10.0
FREQUENTLY	4	3	14.3	15.0	25.0
ALMOST ALWAYS	5	10	47.6	50.0	75.0
NA	6	5	23.8	25.0	100.0
	.	1	4.8	MISSING	
		-----	-----	-----	
	TOTAL	21	100.0	100.0	
Mean	4.700	Std Dev	1.418	Minimum	1.000
Maximum	6.000				

Valid Cases 20 Missing Cases 1

Part V - Commanders of Other Units (Cont)

Q54 FREQUENCY OF PT PER WEEK

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
\$3 PER WEEK	1	1	4.8	5.0	5.0
3 PER WEEK	2	6	28.6	30.0	35.0
5 PER WEEK	4	11	52.4	55.0	90.0
	5	2	9.5	10.0	100.0
	.	1	4.8	MISSING	
	TOTAL	21	100.0	100.0	
Mean	3.350	Std Dev	1.182	Minimum	1.000
Maximum	5.000				
Valid Cases	20	Missing Cases	1		

Q55 LENGTH OF GARRISON DUTY DAY

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
\$8 HOURS	1	2	9.5	10.0	10.0
8-9 HOURS	2	7	33.3	35.0	45.0
10-11 HOURS	3	4	19.0	20.0	65.0
12 HOURS	4	4	19.0	20.0	85.0
¶12 HOURS	5	3	14.3	15.0	100.0
	.	1	4.8	MISSING	
	TOTAL	21	100.0	100.0	
Mean	2.950	Std Dev	1.276	Minimum	1.000
Maximum	5.000				
Valid Cases	20	Missing Cases	1		

Q56 OFF PROF DEV PROGRAM

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
YES	1	18	85.7	85.7	85.7
NO	2	3	14.3	14.3	100.0
	TOTAL	21	100.0	100.0	
Mean	1.143	Std Dev	.359	Minimum	1.000
Maximum	2.000				
Valid Cases	21	Missing Cases	0		

Part V - Commanders of Other Units (Cont)

Q57 HAD SUFFICIENT TRNG DAYS

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
STRONGLY AGREE	1	6	28.6	28.6	28.6
AGREE	2	10	47.6	47.6	76.2
NEUTRAL	3	1	4.8	4.8	81.0
DISAGREE	4	3	14.3	14.3	95.2
STRONGLY DISAGREE	5	1	4.8	4.8	100.0
		-----	-----	-----	
	TOTAL	21	100.0	100.0	
Mean	2.190	Std Dev	1.167	Minimum	1.000
Maximum	5.000				

Valid Cases 21 Missing Cases 0

Q58 NEW SOLDIERS HAD BASIC SOLDIER SKILLS

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
AGREE	2	13	61.9	68.4	68.4
NEUTRAL	3	3	14.3	15.8	84.2
DISAGREE	4	1	4.8	5.3	89.5
STRONGLY DISAGREE	5	2	9.5	10.5	100.0
	.	2	9.5	MISSING	
		-----	-----	-----	
	TOTAL	21	100.0	100.0	
Mean	2.579	Std Dev	1.017	Minimum	2.000
Maximum	5.000				

Valid Cases 19 Missing Cases 2

Part V - Commanders of Other Units (Cont)

Q59 NEW SOLDIERS HAD BASIC MOS SKILLS

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
STRONGLY AGREE	1	2	9.5	10.5	10.5
AGREE	2	8	38.1	42.1	52.6
NEUTRAL	3	7	33.3	36.8	89.5
STRONGLY DISAGREE	5	2	9.5	10.5	100.0
	.	2	9.5	MISSING	
		-----	-----	-----	
	TOTAL	21	100.0	100.0	
Mean	2.579	Std Dev	1.071	Minimum	1.000
Maximum	5.000				
Valid Cases	19	Missing Cases	2		

Q60 NCOS KNOW AND ABIL TO TRAIN

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
STRONGLY AGREE	1	5	23.8	25.0	25.0
AGREE	2	11	52.4	55.0	80.0
NEUTRAL	3	1	4.8	5.0	85.0
DISAGREE	4	2	9.5	10.0	95.0
STRONGLY DISAGREE	5	1	4.8	5.0	100.0
	.	1	4.8	MISSING	
		-----	-----	-----	
	TOTAL	21	100.0	100.0	
Mean	2.150	Std Dev	1.089	Minimum	1.000
Maximum	5.000				
Valid Cases	20	Missing Cases	1		

Q61 JR OFF SKILL AND KNOW TO TRAIN

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
STRONGLY AGREE	1	3	14.3	14.3	14.3
AGREE	2	15	71.4	71.4	85.7
DISAGREE	4	3	14.3	14.3	100.0
		-----	-----	-----	
	TOTAL	21	100.0	100.0	
Mean	2.143	Std Dev	.854	Minimum	1.000
Maximum	4.000				
Valid Cases	21	Missing Cases	0		

Part V - Commanders of Other Units (Cont)

Q62 JR OFF GROUNDED IN UNIT DOCTRINE

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
AGREE	2	8	38.1	38.1	38.1
NEUTRAL	3	5	23.8	23.8	61.9
DISAGREE	4	7	33.3	33.3	95.2
STRONGLY DISAGREE	5	1	4.8	4.8	100.0
TOTAL		21	100.0	100.0	
Mean	3.048	Std Dev	.973	Minimum	2.000
Maximum	5.000				
Valid Cases	21	Missing Cases	0		

Q63 LEAVENWORTH PCC ADEQUATE

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
AGREE	2	12	57.1	63.2	63.2
NEUTRAL	3	7	33.3	36.8	100.0
.	.	2	9.5	MISSING	
TOTAL		21	100.0	100.0	
Mean	2.368	Std Dev	.496	Minimum	2.000
Maximum	3.000				
Valid Cases	19	Missing Cases	2		

Q64 BRANCH PCC ADEQUATE

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
STRONGLY AGREE	1	4	19.0	20.0	20.0
AGREE	2	7	33.3	35.0	55.0
NEUTRAL	3	6	28.6	30.0	85.0
DISAGREE	4	2	9.5	10.0	95.0
STRONGLY DISAGREE	5	1	4.8	5.0	100.0
.	.	1	4.8	MISSING	
TOTAL		21	100.0	100.0	
Mean	2.450	Std Dev	1.099	Minimum	1.000
Maximum	5.000				
Valid Cases	20	Missing Cases	1		

Part V - Commanders of Other Units (Cont)

Q65 JR SOLDIERS BETTER EDUCATED THAN NCOS

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
AGREE	2	7	33.3	35.0	35.0
NEUTRAL	3	6	28.6	30.0	65.0
DISAGREE	4	6	28.6	30.0	95.0
STRONGLY DISAGREE	5	1	4.8	5.0	100.0
	.	1	4.8	MISSING	
		-----	-----	-----	
	TOTAL	21	100.0	100.0	
Mean	3.050	Std Dev	.945	Minimum	2.000
Maximum	5.000				
Valid Cases	20	Missing Cases	1		

Q66 OFF UNDERSTOOD ORG STRUC AND RELTN

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
STRONGLY AGREE	1	3	14.3	14.3	14.3
AGREE	2	15	71.4	71.4	85.7
NEUTRAL	3	1	4.8	4.8	90.5
DISAGREE	4	2	9.5	9.5	100.0
		-----	-----	-----	
	TOTAL	21	100.0	100.0	
Mean	2.095	Std Dev	.768	Minimum	1.000
Maximum	4.000				
Valid Cases	21	Missing Cases	0		

Q67 POST COMMAND CLIMATE SATISFACTORY

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
STRONGLY AGREE	1	8	38.1	42.1	42.1
AGREE	2	7	33.3	36.8	78.9
NEUTRAL	3	1	4.8	5.3	84.2
DISAGREE	4	3	14.3	15.8	100.0
	.	2	9.5	MISSING	
		-----	-----	-----	
	TOTAL	21	100.0	100.0	
Mean	1.947	Std Dev	1.079	Minimum	1.000
Maximum	4.000				
Valid Cases	19	Missing Cases	2		

Part V - Commanders of Other Units (Cont)

Q68 CHAIN OF COMMAND VALUES MATCHED YOURS

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
STRONGLY AGREE	1	4	19.0	19.0	19.0
AGREE	2	15	71.4	71.4	90.5
NEUTRAL	3	2	9.5	9.5	100.0
		-----	-----	-----	
	TOTAL	21	100.0	100.0	
Mean	1.905	Std Dev	.539	Minimum	1.000
Maximum	3.000				
Valid Cases	21	Missing Cases	0		

Q69 COC SUPPORTED ACCURATE REPORTING

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
STRONGLY AGREE	1	8	38.1	38.1	38.1
AGREE	2	11	52.4	52.4	90.5
NEUTRAL	3	2	9.5	9.5	100.0
		-----	-----	-----	
	TOTAL	21	100.0	100.0	
Mean	1.714	Std Dev	.644	Minimum	1.000
Maximum	3.000				
Valid Cases	21	Missing Cases	0		

Q70 ACCURATE ASSESSMENTS AND REPORTS UP

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
STRONGLY AGREE	1	5	23.8	23.8	23.8
AGREE	2	13	61.9	61.9	85.7
NEUTRAL	3	2	9.5	9.5	95.2
DISAGREE	4	1	4.8	4.8	100.0
		-----	-----	-----	
	TOTAL	21	100.0	100.0	
Mean	1.952	Std Dev	.740	Minimum	1.000
Maximum	4.000				
Valid Cases	21	Missing Cases	0		



Part V - Commanders of Other Units (Cont)

Q71 NCO MORAL AND ETHICAL STDS SAT

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
STRONGLY AGREE	1	3	14.3	14.3	14.3
AGREE	2	13	61.9	61.9	76.2
NEUTRAL	3	5	23.8	23.8	100.0
		-----	-----	-----	
	TOTAL	21	100.0	100.0	
Mean	2.095	Std Dev	.625	Minimum	1.000
Maximum	3.000				
Valid Cases	21	Missing Cases	0		

Q72 OFF MORAL AND ETHICAL STDS SAT

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
STRONGLY AGREE	1	7	33.3	33.3	33.3
AGREE	2	11	52.4	52.4	85.7
NEUTRAL	3	3	14.3	14.3	100.0
		-----	-----	-----	
	TOTAL	21	100.0	100.0	
Mean	1.810	Std Dev	.680	Minimum	1.000
Maximum	3.000				
Valid Cases	21	Missing Cases	0		

Q73 DRUG/ALCOHOL PROBLEM FOR JR EM

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
NEUTRAL	3	3	14.3	15.0	15.0
DISAGREE	4	7	33.3	35.0	50.0
STRONGLY DISAGREE	5	10	47.6	50.0	100.0
	.	1	4.8	MISSING	
		-----	-----	-----	
	TOTAL	21	100.0	100.0	
Mean	4.350	Std Dev	.745	Minimum	3.000
Maximum	5.000				
Valid Cases	20	Missing Cases	1		

Part V - Commanders of Other Units (Cont)

Q74 DRUG/ALCOHOL PROBLEM FOR NCOS

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
AGREE	2	3	14.3	15.0	15.0
NEUTRAL	3	3	14.3	15.0	30.0
DISAGREE	4	8	38.1	40.0	70.0
STRONGLY DISAGREE	5	6	28.6	30.0	100.0
.	.	1	4.8	MISSING	
		-----	-----	-----	
	TOTAL	21	100.0	100.0	
Mean	3.850	Std Dev	1.040	Minimum	2.000
Maximum	5.000				
Valid Cases	20	Missing Cases	1		

Q75 DRUG/ALCOHOL PROBLEM FOR OFF

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
NEUTRAL	3	3	14.3	15.0	15.0
DISAGREE	4	5	23.8	25.0	40.0
STRONGLY DISAGREE	5	12	57.1	60.0	100.0
.	.	1	4.8	MISSING	
		-----	-----	-----	
	TOTAL	21	100.0	100.0	
Mean	4.450	Std Dev	.759	Minimum	3.000
Maximum	5.000				
Valid Cases	20	Missing Cases	1		

Q79 UCMJ ACTIONS PER MONTH

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
0-5	1	17	81.0	89.5	89.5
6-10	2	1	4.8	5.3	94.7
11-15	3	1	4.8	5.3	100.0
.	.	2	9.5	MISSING	
		-----	-----	-----	
	TOTAL	21	100.0	100.0	
Mean	1.158	Std Dev	.501	Minimum	1.000
Maximum	3.000				
Valid Cases	19	Missing Cases	2		

Part V - Commanders of Other Units (Cont)

Q81           FREQ MENTORED BY CDR

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
WEEKLY	2	4	19.0	19.0	19.0
MONTHLY	3	5	23.8	23.8	42.9
QUARTERLY	4	5	23.8	23.8	66.7
ANNUALLY	5	2	9.5	9.5	76.2
AT OER TIME	6	1	4.8	4.8	81.0
NEVER	7	4	19.0	19.0	100.0
		-----	-----	-----	
	TOTAL	21	100.0	100.0	
Mean	4.143	Std Dev	1.769	Minimum	2.000
Maximum	7.000				

Valid Cases           21           Missing Cases           0

Q82           FREQ COUNSELED SUBORDINATES

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
DAILY	1	2	9.5	9.5	9.5
WEEKLY	2	6	28.6	28.6	38.1
MONTHLY	3	5	23.8	23.8	61.9
QUARTERLY	4	7	33.3	33.3	95.2
ANNUALLY	5	1	4.8	4.8	100.0
		-----	-----	-----	
	TOTAL	21	100.0	100.0	
Mean	2.952	Std Dev	1.117	Minimum	1.000
Maximum	5.000				

Valid Cases           21           Missing Cases           0

Part V - Commanders of Other Units (Cont)

Q83            FREQ POSITIVE WRITTEN COUNSELING

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
DAILY	1	1	4.8	4.8	4.8
WEEKLY	2	1	4.8	4.8	9.5
MONTHLY	3	4	19.0	19.0	28.6
QUARTERLY	4	8	38.1	38.1	66.7
ANNUALLY	5	2	9.5	9.5	76.2
AT OER TIME	6	3	14.3	14.3	90.5
NEVER	7	2	9.5	9.5	100.0
		-----	-----	-----	
	TOTAL	21	100.0	100.0	
Mean	4.238	Std Dev	1.546	Minimum	1.000
Maximum	7.000				
Valid Cases	21	Missing Cases	0		

Q84            YOUR FREEDOM TO COMMAND

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
MODERATE	2	3	14.3	14.3	14.3
HIGH	3	18	85.7	85.7	100.0
		-----	-----	-----	
	TOTAL	21	100.0	100.0	
Mean	2.857	Std Dev	.359	Minimum	2.000
Maximum	3.000				
Valid Cases	21	Missing Cases	0		

Q85            YOUR SUBORDINATES FREEDOM TO CMD

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
MODERATE	2	7	33.3	33.3	33.3
HIGH	3	14	66.7	66.7	100.0
		-----	-----	-----	
	TOTAL	21	100.0	100.0	
Mean	2.667	Std Dev	.483	Minimum	2.000
Maximum	3.000				
Valid Cases	21	Missing Cases	0		

Part V - Commanders of Other Units (Cont)

Q86 IMPORTANCE OF STATISTICS

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
NO IMPORTANCE	1	1	4.8	4.8	4.8
ABOUT RIGHT	3	15	71.4	71.4	76.2
A LITTLE TOO MUCH	4	3	14.3	14.3	90.5
ENTIRELY TOO MUCH	5	2	9.5	9.5	100.0
		-----	-----	-----	
	TOTAL	21	100.0	100.0	
Mean	3.238	Std Dev	.831	Minimum	1.000
Maximum	5.000				

Valid Cases 21 Missing Cases 0

Q87 YOUR SENIOR RATER PROFILE KNOWN

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
YES	1	15	71.4	71.4	71.4
NO	2	6	28.6	28.6	100.0
		-----	-----	-----	
	TOTAL	21	100.0	100.0	
Mean	1.286	Std Dev	.463	Minimum	1.000
Maximum	2.000				

Valid Cases 21 Missing Cases 0

Q88 DISCUSS RATINGS WITH SUBORDINATES

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
YES	1	21	100.0	100.0	100.0
		-----	-----	-----	
	TOTAL	21	100.0	100.0	
Mean	1.000	Std Dev	0.0	Minimum	1.000
Maximum	1.000				

Valid Cases 21 Missing Cases 0

Part V - Commanders of Other Units (Cont)

Q89 YOUR SENIOR RATER'S PROFILE KNOWN

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
YES	1	7	33.3	35.0	35.0
NO	2	13	61.9	65.0	100.0
	.	1	4.8	MISSING	
	TOTAL	21	100.0	100.0	
Mean	1.650	Std Dev	.489	Minimum	1.000
Maximum	2.000				
Valid Cases	20	Missing Cases	1		

Q90 RATER DISCUSSED YOUR REPORT PRIOR

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
YES	1	13	61.9	65.0	65.0
NO	2	7	33.3	35.0	100.0
	.	1	4.8	MISSING	
	TOTAL	21	100.0	100.0	
Mean	1.350	Std Dev	.489	Minimum	1.000
Maximum	2.000				
Valid Cases	20	Missing Cases	1		

Q91 SR RTR DISCUSSED YOUR REPORT PRIOR

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
YES	1	5	23.8	25.0	25.0
NO	2	15	71.4	75.0	100.0
	.	1	4.8	MISSING	
	TOTAL	21	100.0	100.0	
Mean	1.750	Std Dev	.444	Minimum	1.000
Maximum	2.000				
Valid Cases	20	Missing Cases	1		

Part V - Commanders of Other Units (Cont)

Q92 SUPPORT FROM HIGHER HEADQUARTERS

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
DISSATISFIED	2	1	4.8	4.8	4.8
BORDERLINE	3	3	14.3	14.3	19.0
SATISFIED	4	12	57.1	57.1	76.2
VERY SATISFIED	5	5	23.8	23.8	100.0
		-----	-----	-----	
TOTAL		21	100.0	100.0	
Mean	4.000	Std Dev	.775	Minimum	2.000
Maximum	5.000				
Valid Cases	21	Missing Cases	0		

Q93 HIGHER CDRS KNEW YOUR UNIT STATUS

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
DISSATISFIED	2	2	9.5	9.5	9.5
BORDERLINE	3	2	9.5	9.5	19.0
SATISFIED	4	12	57.1	57.1	76.2
VERY SATISFIED	5	5	23.8	23.8	100.0
		-----	-----	-----	
TOTAL		21	100.0	100.0	
Mean	3.952	Std Dev	.865	Minimum	2.000
Maximum	5.000				
Valid Cases	21	Missing Cases	0		

Q94 FREQ OF IMMEDIATE CDR VISITS

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
WEEKLY	2	5	23.8	23.8	23.8
MONTHLY	3	7	33.3	33.3	57.1
QUARTERLY	4	4	19.0	19.0	76.2
SEMI-ANNUALLY	5	4	19.0	19.0	95.2
ANNUALLY	6	1	4.8	4.8	100.0
		-----	-----	-----	
TOTAL		21	100.0	100.0	
Mean	3.476	Std Dev	1.209	Minimum	2.000
Maximum	6.000				
Valid Cases	21	Missing Cases	0		

Part V - Commanders of Other Units (Cont)

Q95 SENIOR CDRS WOULD SPT IN HARD TIMES

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
STRONGLY AGREE	1	9	42.9	45.0	45.0
AGREE	2	10	47.6	50.0	95.0
NEUTRAL	3	1	4.8	5.0	100.0
	.	1	4.8	MISSING	
		-----	-----	-----	
	TOTAL	21	100.0	100.0	
Mean	1.600	Std Dev	.598	Minimum	1.000
Maximum	3.000				

Valid Cases 20 Missing Cases 1

-----

Q96 SAT CMD CLIMATE FROM HIGHER HQ

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
STRONGLY AGREE	1	6	28.6	28.6	28.6
AGREE	2	11	52.4	52.4	81.0
DISAGREE	4	4	19.0	19.0	100.0
		-----	-----	-----	
	TOTAL	21	100.0	100.0	
Mean	2.095	Std Dev	1.044	Minimum	1.000
Maximum	4.000				

Valid Cases 21 Missing Cases 0



Part V - Commanders of Other Units (Cont)

Q97 CHAIN OF CMD FAIR TO COMMANDERS

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
YES	1	19	90.5	90.5	90.5
NO	2	2	9.5	9.5	100.0
		-----	-----	-----	
	TOTAL	21	100.0	100.0	

Mean 1.095 Std Dev .301 Minimum 1.000  
Maximum 2.000

Valid Cases 21 Missing Cases 0

Q98 HOW POSITIVE ABOUT ARMY CAREER

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
MUCH MORE POSITIVELY	1	4	19.0	19.0	19.0
MORE POSITIVELY	2	5	23.8	23.8	42.9
ABOUT THE SAME	3	10	47.6	47.6	90.5
LESS POSITIVELY	4	2	9.5	9.5	100.0
		-----	-----	-----	
	TOTAL	21	100.0	100.0	

Mean 2.476 Std Dev .928 Minimum 1.000  
Maximum 4.000

Valid Cases 21 Missing Cases 0

# Part VI - Results of All Commanders

## Q11 ACCOMPANIED TOUR

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
YES WITH SPOUSE	1	242	93.8	94.2	94.2
YES WITHOUT SPOUSE	2	3	1.2	1.2	95.3
NO	3	3	1.2	1.2	96.5
N/A	4	9	3.5	3.5	100.0
	.	1	.4	MISSING	
		-----	-----	-----	
	TOTAL	258	100.0	100.0	
Mean	1.140	Std Dev	.596	Minimum	1.000
Maximum	4.000				

Valid Cases 257 Missing Cases 1

## Q12 LIVED ON POST

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
YES	1	178	69.0	69.3	69.3
NO	2	78	30.2	30.4	99.6
	5	1	.4	.4	100.0
	.	1	.4	MISSING	
		-----	-----	-----	
	TOTAL	258	100.0	100.0	
Mean	1.319	Std Dev	.515	Minimum	1.000
Maximum	5.000				

Valid Cases 257 Missing Cases 1

## Q13 SPOUSE PARTICIPATION

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
ALMOST NEVER	1	7	2.7	2.8	2.8
SELDOM	2	6	2.3	2.4	5.2
SOMETIMES	3	23	8.9	9.2	14.5
FREQUENTLY	4	54	20.9	21.7	36.1
ALMOST ALWAYS	5	159	61.6	63.9	100.0
	.	9	3.5	MISSING	
		-----	-----	-----	
	TOTAL	258	100.0	100.0	
Mean	4.414	Std Dev	.955	Minimum	1.000
Maximum	5.000				

Valid Cases 249 Missing Cases 9

Part VI - All Commanders (Cont)

Q14 SPOUSE EMPLOYMENT

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
FULL TIME	1	53	20.5	21.5	21.5
PART TIME	2	69	26.7	27.9	49.4
NOT OUTSIDE HOME	3	124	48.1	50.2	99.6
	4	1	.4	.4	100.0
	.	11	4.3	MISSING	
		-----	-----	-----	
	TOTAL	258	100.0	100.0	
Mean	2.296	Std Dev	.805	Minimum	1.000
Maximum	4.000				
Valid Cases	247	Missing Cases	11		

Q15 DIRECT INPUT IN DEVELOPING COB

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
YES	1	169	65.5	66.8	66.8
SOMETIMES	2	41	15.9	16.2	83.0
NO	3	42	16.3	16.6	99.6
	5	1	.4	.4	100.0
	.	5	1.9	MISSING	
		-----	-----	-----	
	TOTAL	258	100.0	100.0	
Mean	1.510	Std Dev	.795	Minimum	1.000
Maximum	5.000				
Valid Cases	253	Missing Cases	5		

Part VI - All Commanders (Cont)

Q16 PERCENT TIME ON BUDGET MANAGEMENT

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
\$10%	1	177	68.6	69.1	69.1
11-20%	2	56	21.7	21.9	91.0
21-30%	3	15	5.8	5.9	96.9
31-40%	4	4	1.6	1.6	98.4
41-50%	5	4	1.6	1.6	100.0
.	.	2	.8	MISSING	
		-----	-----	-----	
	TOTAL	258	100.0	100.0	
Mean	1.445	Std Dev	.805	Minimum	1.000
Maximum	5.000				
Valid Cases	256	Missing Cases	2		

Q17 ENOUGH AMMUNITION FOR STRAC

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
YES	1	149	57.8	58.4	58.4
NO	2	78	30.2	30.6	89.0
NA	3	27	10.5	10.6	99.6
	5	1	.4	.4	100.0
.	.	3	1.2	MISSING	
		-----	-----	-----	
	TOTAL	258	100.0	100.0	
Mean	1.533	Std Dev	.714	Minimum	1.000
Maximum	5.000				
Valid Cases	255	Missing Cases	3		

Part VI - All Commanders (Cont)

Q18 SUFFICIENT TRAINING FUNDS

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
ALMOST NEVER	1	2	.8	.8	.8
SELDOM	2	12	4.7	4.7	5.4
SOMETIMES	3	27	10.5	10.5	16.0
FREQUENTLY	4	60	23.3	23.3	39.3
ALMOST ALWAYS	5	156	60.5	60.7	100.0
	.	1	.4	MISSING	
		-----	-----	-----	
	TOTAL	258	100.0	100.0	
Mean	4.385	Std Dev	.908	Minimum	1.000
Maximum	5.000				
Valid Cases	257	Missing Cases	1		

Q19 AVERAGE PERSONNEL TURNOVER RATE

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
\$10%	1	106	41.1	41.2	41.2
11-15%	2	110	42.6	42.8	84.0
16-20%	3	29	11.2	11.3	95.3
21-25%	4	6	2.3	2.3	97.7
26-30%	5	4	1.6	1.6	99.2
¶30%	6	2	.8	.8	100.0
	.	1	.4	MISSING	
		-----	-----	-----	
	TOTAL	258	100.0	100.0	
Mean	1.825	Std Dev	.925	Minimum	1.000
Maximum	6.000				
Valid Cases	257	Missing Cases	1		

Part VI - All Commanders (Cont)

Q20 AVAILABILITY OF TRAINING RESOURCES

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
ALMOST NEVER	1	4	1.6	1.6	1.6
SELDOM	2	10	3.9	3.9	5.5
SOMETIMES	3	48	18.6	18.8	24.2
FREQUENTLY	4	111	43.0	43.4	67.6
ALMOST ALWAYS	5	83	32.2	32.4	100.0
	.	2	.8	MISSING	
		-----	-----	-----	
	TOTAL	258	100.0	100.0	
Mean	4.012	Std Dev	.901	Minimum	1.000
Maximum	5.000				
Valid Cases	256	Missing Cases	2		

Q21 UFRS INHIBITED TRAINING

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
ALMOST NEVER	1	93	36.0	36.5	36.5
SELDOM	2	89	34.5	34.9	71.4
SOMETIMES	3	58	22.5	22.7	94.1
FREQUENTLY	4	13	5.0	5.1	99.2
ALMOST ALWAYS	5	2	.8	.8	100.0
	.	3	1.2	MISSING	
		-----	-----	-----	
	TOTAL	258	100.0	100.0	
Mean	1.988	Std Dev	.933	Minimum	1.000
Maximum	5.000				
Valid Cases	255	Missing Cases	3		

Part VI - All Commanders (Cont)

Q22 ALO

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
1	1	138	53.5	53.7	53.7
2	2	69	26.7	26.8	80.5
3	3	15	5.8	5.8	86.4
NA	4	33	12.8	12.8	99.2
	5	2	.8	.8	100.0
	.	1	.4	MISSING	
		-----	-----	-----	
	TOTAL	258	100.0	100.0	
Mean	1.802	Std Dev	1.070	Minimum	1.000
Maximum	5.000				
Valid Cases	257	Missing Cases	1		

Q23 CRITICAL RESOURCES SHARED

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
DONT KNOW	1	14	5.4	5.5	5.5
NOT AT ALL	2	30	11.6	11.7	17.2
SLIGHTLY	3	92	35.7	35.9	53.1
MODERATELY	4	83	32.2	32.4	85.5
GREATLY	5	37	14.3	14.5	100.0
	.	2	.8	MISSING	
		-----	-----	-----	
	TOTAL	258	100.0	100.0	
Mean	3.387	Std Dev	1.045	Minimum	1.000
Maximum	5.000				
Valid Cases	256	Missing Cases	2		

Part VI - All Commanders (Cont)

Q24 CRITICAL RESOURCES CROSSLEVELED

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
DONT KNOW	1	6	2.3	2.3	2.3
NOT AT ALL	2	24	9.3	9.4	11.7
SLIGHTLY	3	101	39.1	39.5	51.2
MODERATELY	4	87	33.7	34.0	85.2
GREATLY	5	38	14.7	14.8	100.0
.	.	2	.8	MISSING	
		-----	-----	-----	
	TOTAL	258	100.0	100.0	
Mean	3.496	Std Dev	.937	Minimum	1.000
Maximum	5.000				
Valid Cases	256	Missing Cases	2		

Q25 OTHER UNITS WITH HIGHER PRIORITY

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
YES	1	98	38.0	38.9	38.9
NO	2	149	57.8	59.1	98.0
	3	3	1.2	1.2	99.2
	5	2	.8	.8	100.0
	.	6	2.3	MISSING	
		-----	-----	-----	
	TOTAL	258	100.0	100.0	
Mean	1.647	Std Dev	.591	Minimum	1.000
Maximum	5.000				
Valid Cases	252	Missing Cases	6		



Part VI - All Commanders (Cont)

Q26 FACILITY AVAIL DEGRADED TRAINING

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
DONT KNOW	1	2	.8	.8	.8
NOT AT ALL	2	91	35.3	35.4	36.2
SLIGHTLY	3	109	42.2	42.4	78.6
MODERATELY	4	43	16.7	16.7	95.3
GREATLY	5	12	4.7	4.7	100.0
	.	1	.4	MISSING	
		-----	-----	-----	
	TOTAL	258	100.0	100.0	
Mean	2.891	Std Dev	.855	Minimum	1.000
Maximum	5.000				
Valid Cases	257	Missing Cases	1		

Q27 MOS SHORTAGES DEGRADED EFFECTIVENESS

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
DONT KNOW	1	1	.4	.4	.4
NOT AT ALL	2	51	19.8	19.9	20.3
SLIGHTLY	3	134	51.9	52.3	72.7
MODERATELY	4	58	22.5	22.7	95.3
GREATLY	5	11	4.3	4.3	99.6
	7	1	.4	.4	100.0
	.	2	.8	MISSING	
		-----	-----	-----	
	TOTAL	258	100.0	100.0	
Mean	3.121	Std Dev	.815	Minimum	1.000
Maximum	7.000				
Valid Cases	256	Missing Cases	2		

Part VI - All Commanders (Cont)

Q28 TOTAL COB

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
\$S1 M	1	109	42.2	43.4	43.4
\$1-5 M	2	115	44.6	45.8	89.2
\$6-10 M	3	12	4.7	4.8	94.0
\$10 M	4	14	5.4	5.6	99.6
	5	1	.4	.4	100.0
	.	7	2.7	MISSING	
	TOTAL	258	100.0	100.0	
Mean	1.737	Std Dev	.821	Minimum	1.000
Maximum	5.000				
Valid Cases	251	Missing Cases	7		

Q29 ALO CONSTRAINED READINESS

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
STRONGLY AGREE	1	6	2.3	2.4	2.4
AGREE	2	38	14.7	15.0	17.4
NEUTRAL	3	42	16.3	16.6	34.0
DISAGREE	4	78	30.2	30.8	64.8
STRONGLY DISAGREE	5	89	34.5	35.2	100.0
	.	5	1.9	MISSING	
	TOTAL	258	100.0	100.0	
Mean	3.814	Std Dev	1.141	Minimum	1.000
Maximum	5.000				
Valid Cases	253	Missing Cases	5		

Part VI - All Commanders (Cont)

Q30 REPAIR PARTS REQUISITIONS DEFERRED

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
ALMOST NEVER	1	157	60.9	61.8	61.8
SELDOM	2	33	12.8	13.0	74.8
SOMETIMES	3	51	19.8	20.1	94.9
FREQUENTLY	4	12	4.7	4.7	99.6
ALMOST ALWAYS	5	1	.4	.4	100.0
	.	4	1.6	MISSING	
		-----	-----	-----	
	TOTAL	258	100.0	100.0	
Mean	1.689	Std Dev	.975	Minimum	1.000
Maximum	5.000				
Valid Cases	254	Missing Cases	4		

Q31 BASIS FOR BUDGET

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
PROJECTED EVENTS	1	168	65.1	65.6	65.6
PRIOR EXPENDITURES	2	52	20.2	20.3	85.9
OTHER	3	35	13.6	13.7	99.6
	5	1	.4	.4	100.0
	.	2	.8	MISSING	
		-----	-----	-----	
	TOTAL	258	100.0	100.0	
Mean	1.492	Std Dev	.757	Minimum	1.000
Maximum	5.000				
Valid Cases	256	Missing Cases	2		

Part VI - All Commanders (Cont)

Q32 SUFFICIENT RESOURCES FOR TRAINING

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
ALL I DESIRED	1	53	20.5	20.7	20.7
MOST I DESIRED	2	158	61.2	61.7	82.4
ONLY REQUIRED	3	29	11.2	11.3	93.8
LESS THAN REQUIRED	4	14	5.4	5.5	99.2
MUCH LESS	5	2	.8	.8	100.0
	.	2	.8	MISSING	
		-----	-----	-----	
	TOTAL	258	100.0	100.0	
Mean	2.039	Std Dev	.781	Minimum	1.000
Maximum	5.000				
Valid Cases	256	Missing Cases	2		

Q33 TRAINING DEVELOPMENT BASED ON 25 SERIES

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
STRONGLY AGREE	1	129	50.0	50.6	50.6
AGREE	2	95	36.8	37.3	87.8
NEUTRAL	3	18	7.0	7.1	94.9
DISAGREE	4	10	3.9	3.9	98.8
STRONGLY DISAGREE	5	3	1.2	1.2	100.0
	.	3	1.2	MISSING	
		-----	-----	-----	
	TOTAL	258	100.0	100.0	
Mean	1.678	Std Dev	.859	Minimum	1.000
Maximum	5.000				
Valid Cases	255	Missing Cases	3		

Part VI - All Commanders (Cont)

Q34 CLEAR TRNG GUIDANCE FROM SENIOR HQ

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
STRONGLY AGREE	1	92	35.7	35.9	35.9
AGREE	2	111	43.0	43.4	79.3
NEUTRAL	3	26	10.1	10.2	89.5
DISAGREE	4	18	7.0	7.0	96.5
STRONGLY DISAGREE	5	9	3.5	3.5	100.0
	.	2	.8	MISSING	
		-----	-----	-----	
	TOTAL	258	100.0	100.0	

Mean 1.988 Std Dev 1.031 Minimum 1.000  
Maximum 5.000

Valid Cases 256 Missing Cases 2

Q35 TRNG GUIDANCE SUPPORTED TOUGH TRNG

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
STRONGLY AGREE	1	119	46.1	46.5	46.5
AGREE	2	103	39.9	40.2	86.7
NEUTRAL	3	23	8.9	9.0	95.7
DISAGREE	4	8	3.1	3.1	98.8
STRONGLY DISAGREE	5	3	1.2	1.2	100.0
	.	2	.8	MISSING	
		-----	-----	-----	
	TOTAL	258	100.0	100.0	

Mean 1.723 Std Dev .843 Minimum 1.000  
Maximum 5.000

Valid Cases 256 Missing Cases 2

Part VI - All Commanders (Cont)

Q36 SAME TRNG AREAS DEGRADED TRNG

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
STRONGLY AGREE	1	13	5.0	5.1	5.1
AGREE	2	64	24.8	25.1	30.2
NEUTRAL	3	60	23.3	23.5	53.7
DISAGREE	4	96	37.2	37.6	91.4
STRONGLY DISAGREE	5	22	8.5	8.6	100.0
	.	3	1.2	MISSING	
		-----	-----	-----	
	TOTAL	258	100.0	100.0	
Mean	3.196	Std Dev	1.069	Minimum	1.000
Maximum	5.000				
Valid Cases	255	Missing Cases	3		

Q37 FREQUENCY OF OFF POST TRNG

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
ALMOST NEVER	1	12	4.7	4.7	4.7
SELDOM	2	20	7.8	7.8	12.5
SOMETIMES	3	63	24.4	24.6	37.1
FREQUENTLY	4	108	41.9	42.2	79.3
ALMOST ALWAYS	5	53	20.5	20.7	100.0
	.	2	.8	MISSING	
		-----	-----	-----	
	TOTAL	258	100.0	100.0	
Mean	3.664	Std Dev	1.039	Minimum	1.000
Maximum	5.000				
Valid Cases	256	Missing Cases	2		

Part VI - All Commanders (Cont)

Q38 TRNG BASED ON MTPS

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
STRONGLY AGREE	1	48	18.6	18.8	18.8
AGREE	2	70	27.1	27.5	46.3
NEUTRAL	3	48	18.6	18.8	65.1
DISAGREE	4	50	19.4	19.6	84.7
STRONGLY DISAGREE	5	39	15.1	15.3	100.0
.	.	3	1.2	MISSING	
		-----	-----	-----	
	TOTAL	258	100.0	100.0	
Mean	2.851	Std Dev	1.349	Minimum	1.000
Maximum	5.000				
Valid Cases	255	Missing Cases	3		

Q39 MTPS PROVIDED BASIS FOR TOUGH TRNG

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
STRONGLY AGREE	1	37	14.3	14.8	14.8
AGREE	2	96	37.2	38.4	53.2
NEUTRAL	3	86	33.3	34.4	87.6
DISAGREE	4	17	6.6	6.8	94.4
STRONGLY DISAGREE	5	14	5.4	5.6	100.0
.	.	8	3.1	MISSING	
		-----	-----	-----	
	TOTAL	258	100.0	100.0	
Mean	2.500	Std Dev	1.011	Minimum	1.000
Maximum	5.000				
Valid Cases	250	Missing Cases	8		

Part VI - All Commanders (cont)  
Q41 HIGHER HQ CHANGES HINDERED TRNG

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
ALMOST NEVER	1	27	10.5	10.6	10.6
SELDOM	2	59	22.9	23.1	33.7
SOMETIMES	3	114	44.2	44.7	78.4
FREQUENTLY	4	50	19.4	19.6	98.0
ALMOST ALWAYS	5	5	1.9	2.0	100.0
	.	3	1.2	MISSING	
		-----	-----	-----	
	TOTAL	258	100.0	100.0	
Mean	2.792	Std Dev	.943	Minimum	1.000
Maximum	5.000				
Valid Cases	255	Missing Cases	3		

-----  
Q42 HIGHER HQ DIRECTIVES ENHANCED TRNG

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
STRONGLY AGREE	1	16	6.2	6.2	6.2
AGREE	2	89	34.5	34.6	40.9
NEUTRAL	3	99	38.4	38.5	79.4
DISAGREE	4	45	17.4	17.5	96.9
STRONGLY DISAGREE	5	8	3.1	3.1	100.0
	.	1	.4	MISSING	
		-----	-----	-----	
	TOTAL	258	100.0	100.0	
Mean	2.767	Std Dev	.919	Minimum	1.000
Maximum	5.000				
Valid Cases	257	Missing Cases	1		



Part VI - All Commanders (Cont)

Q43 TRNG INCLUDED COMBINED ARMS AND SLICE

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
ALMOST NEVER	1	38	14.7	15.1	15.1
SELDOM	2	22	8.5	8.8	23.9
SOMETIMES	3	36	14.0	14.3	38.2
FREQUENTLY	4	93	36.0	37.1	75.3
ALMOST ALWAYS	5	62	24.0	24.7	100.0
	.	7	2.7	MISSING	
	TOTAL	258	100.0	100.0	
Mean	3.474	Std Dev	1.354	Minimum	1.000
Maximum	5.000				
Valid Cases	251	Missing Cases	7		

Q44 TRNG WAS JOINT

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
ALMOST NEVER	1	72	27.9	28.1	28.1
SELDOM	2	50	19.4	19.5	47.7
SOMETIMES	3	64	24.8	25.0	72.7
FREQUENTLY	4	45	17.4	17.6	90.2
ALMOST ALWAYS	5	10	3.9	3.9	94.1
	6	15	5.8	5.9	100.0
	.	2	.8	MISSING	
	TOTAL	258	100.0	100.0	
Mean	2.672	Std Dev	1.442	Minimum	1.000
Maximum	6.000				
Valid Cases	256	Missing Cases	2		

Part VI - All Commanders (Cont)

Q45 NCOS ABILITY TO PLAN AND CONDUCT TRNG

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
STRONGLY AGREE	1	56	21.7	22.0	22.0
AGREE	2	129	50.0	50.8	72.8
NEUTRAL	3	28	10.9	11.0	83.9
DISAGREE	4	35	13.6	13.8	97.6
STRONGLY DISAGREE	5	6	2.3	2.4	100.0
	.	4	1.6	MISSING	
	TOTAL	258	100.0	100.0	
Mean	2.236	Std Dev	1.021	Minimum	1.000
Maximum	5.000				
Valid Cases	254	Missing Cases	4		

Q46 OK TO TRNSFR INDIV TRNG FROM AIT TO UNIT

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
STRONGLY AGREE	1	13	5.0	5.1	5.1
AGREE	2	52	20.2	20.6	25.7
NEUTRAL	3	40	15.5	15.8	41.5
DISAGREE	4	88	34.1	34.8	76.3
STRONGLY DISAGREE	5	60	23.3	23.7	100.0
	.	5	1.9	MISSING	
	TOTAL	258	100.0	100.0	
Mean	3.514	Std Dev	1.204	Minimum	1.000
Maximum	5.000				
Valid Cases	253	Missing Cases	5		

Part VI - All Commanders (Cont)

Q47 BNCOC/ANCOC IMPROVED CAPABILITY TO TRN

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
STRONGLY AGREE	1	75	29.1	29.4	29.4
AGREE	2	142	55.0	55.7	85.1
NEUTRAL	3	29	11.2	11.4	96.5
DISAGREE	4	8	3.1	3.1	99.6
STRONGLY DISAGREE	5	1	.4	.4	100.0
	.	3	1.2	MISSING	
		-----	-----	-----	
	TOTAL	258	100.0	100.0	

Mean 1.894 Std Dev .748 Minimum 1.000  
Maximum 5.000

Valid Cases 255 Missing Cases 3

Q48 JR OFF ABLE TO PLAN, CONDUCT TRNG

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
STRONGLY AGREE	1	47	18.2	18.5	18.5
AGREE	2	151	58.5	59.4	78.0
NEUTRAL	3	36	14.0	14.2	92.1
DISAGREE	4	18	7.0	7.1	99.2
STRONGLY DISAGREE	5	2	.8	.8	100.0
	.	4	1.6	MISSING	
		-----	-----	-----	
	TOTAL	258	100.0	100.0	

Mean 2.122 Std Dev .818 Minimum 1.000  
Maximum 5.000

Valid Cases 254 Missing Cases 4

Part VI - All Commanders (Cont)

Q49 SCENARIOS AT CTC SUPPORTED ALB

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
STRONGLY AGREE	1	78	30.2	31.7	31.7
AGREE	2	87	33.7	35.4	67.1
NEUTRAL	3	75	29.1	30.5	97.6
DISAGREE	4	5	1.9	2.0	99.6
STRONGLY DISAGREE	5	1	.4	.4	100.0
	.	12	4.7	MISSING	
		-----	-----	-----	
	TOTAL	258	100.0	100.0	

Mean 2.041 Std Dev .861 Minimum 1.000  
Maximum 5.000

Valid Cases 246 Missing Cases 12

Q50 CTC PERFORMANCE ON OER

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
YES, EXPLICITLY	1	76	29.5	33.6	33.6
YES, IMPLICITLY	2	35	13.6	15.5	49.1
NO	3	68	26.4	30.1	79.2
DONT KNOW	4	43	16.7	19.0	98.2
	5	3	1.2	1.3	99.6
	6	1	.4	.4	100.0
	.	32	12.4	MISSING	
		-----	-----	-----	
	TOTAL	258	100.0	100.0	

Mean 2.403 Std Dev 1.197 Minimum 1.000  
Maximum 6.000

Valid Cases 226 Missing Cases 32

Part VI - All Commanders (Cont)

Q51 NUMBER OF CTC ROTATIONS

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
NONE	1	87	33.7	34.4	34.4
1	2	43	16.7	17.0	51.4
2	3	33	12.8	13.0	64.4
3	4	23	8.9	9.1	73.5
4 OR MORE	5	27	10.5	10.7	84.2
NA	6	40	15.5	15.8	100.0
	.	5	1.9	MISSING	
		-----	-----	-----	
	TOTAL	258	100.0	100.0	

Mean 2.921 Std Dev 1.869 Minimum 1.000  
Maximum 6.000

Valid Cases 253 Missing Cases 5

Q52 FREQUENCY OF QTBS

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
NEVER	1	26	10.1	10.2	10.2
ANNUALLY	2	7	2.7	2.7	12.9
SEMI-ANNUALLY	3	26	10.1	10.2	23.0
QUARTERLY	4	189	73.3	73.8	96.9
MORE THAN QUARTERLY	5	7	2.7	2.7	99.6
	6	1	.4	.4	100.0
	.	2	.8	MISSING	
		-----	-----	-----	
	TOTAL	258	100.0	100.0	

Mean 3.574 Std Dev .995 Minimum 1.000  
Maximum 6.000

Valid Cases 256 Missing Cases 2

Part VI - All Commanders (Cont)

Q53            ATTAIN STDS FOR INDIV MARKSMENSHIP

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
NEVER	1	2	.8	.8	.8
SELDOM	2	8	3.1	3.1	3.9
SOMETIMES	3	15	5.8	5.9	9.8
FREQUENTLY	4	42	16.3	16.4	26.2
ALMOST ALWAYS	5	183	70.9	71.5	97.7
NA	6	6	2.3	2.3	100.0
	.	2	.8	MISSING	
		-----	-----	-----	
	TOTAL	258	100.0	100.0	
Mean	4.617	Std Dev	.827	Minimum	1.000
Maximum	6.000				
Valid Cases	256	Missing Cases	2		

Q54            FREQUENCY OF PT PER WEEK

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
\$3 PER WEEK	1	6	2.3	2.4	2.4
3 PER WEEK	2	110	42.6	43.1	45.5
4 PER WEEK	3	32	12.4	12.5	58.0
5 PER WEEK	4	88	34.1	34.5	92.5
	5	19	7.4	7.5	100.0
	.	3	1.2	MISSING	
		-----	-----	-----	
	TOTAL	258	100.0	100.0	
Mean	3.016	Std Dev	1.083	Minimum	1.000
Maximum	5.000				
Valid Cases	255	Missing Cases	3		

Part VI - All Commanders (Cont)

Q55 LENGTH OF GARRISON DUTY DAY

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
\$8 HOURS	1	22	8.5	8.7	8.7
8-9 HOURS	2	91	35.3	35.8	44.5
10-11 HOURS	3	120	46.5	47.2	91.7
12 HOURS	4	13	5.0	5.1	96.9
¶12 HOURS	5	8	3.1	3.1	100.0
	.	4	1.6	MISSING	
		-----	-----	-----	
	TOTAL	258	100.0	100.0	
Mean	2.583	Std Dev	.843	Minimum	1.000
Maximum	5.000				
Valid Cases	254	Missing Cases	4		

Q56 OFF PROF DEV PROGRAM

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
YES	1	231	89.5	90.2	90.2
NO	2	24	9.3	9.4	99.6
	4	1	.4	.4	100.0
	.	2	.8	MISSING	
		-----	-----	-----	
	TOTAL	258	100.0	100.0	
Mean	1.105	Std Dev	.344	Minimum	1.000
Maximum	4.000				
Valid Cases	256	Missing Cases	2		

Part VI - All Commanders (Cont)

Q57 HAD SUFFICIENT TRNG DAYS

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
STRONGLY AGREE	1	48	18.6	18.8	18.8
AGREE	2	131	50.8	51.2	69.9
NEUTRAL	3	18	7.0	7.0	77.0
DISAGREE	4	51	19.8	19.9	96.9
STRONGLY DISAGREE	5	8	3.1	3.1	100.0
	.	2	.8	MISSING	
	TOTAL	258	100.0	100.0	
Mean	2.375	Std Dev	1.095	Minimum	1.000
Maximum	5.000				
Valid Cases	256	Missing Cases	2		

Q58 NEW SOLDIERS HAD BASIC SOLDIER SKILLS

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
STRONGLY AGREE	1	10	3.9	3.9	3.9
AGREE	2	133	51.6	52.2	56.1
NEUTRAL	3	36	14.0	14.1	70.2
DISAGREE	4	65	25.2	25.5	95.7
STRONGLY DISAGREE	5	11	4.3	4.3	100.0
	.	3	1.2	MISSING	
	TOTAL	258	100.0	100.0	
Mean	2.741	Std Dev	1.021	Minimum	1.000
Maximum	5.000				
Valid Cases	255	Missing Cases	3		



Part VI - All Commanders (Cont)

Q59 NEW SOLDIERS HAD BASIC MOS SKILLS

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
STRONGLY AGREE	1	9	3.5	3.5	3.5
AGREE	2	83	32.2	32.7	36.2
NEUTRAL	3	52	20.2	20.5	56.7
DISAGREE	4	104	40.3	40.9	97.6
STRONGLY DISAGREE	5	6	2.3	2.4	100.0
	.	4	1.6	MISSING	
		-----	-----	-----	
	TOTAL	258	100.0	100.0	
Mean	3.059	Std Dev	.986	Minimum	1.000
Maximum	5.000				
Valid Cases	254	Missing Cases	4		

Q60 NCOS KNOW AND ABIL TO TRAIN

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
STRONGLY AGREE	1	30	11.6	11.7	11.7
AGREE	2	144	55.8	56.3	68.0
NEUTRAL	3	35	13.6	13.7	81.6
DISAGREE	4	38	14.7	14.8	96.5
STRONGLY DISAGREE	5	9	3.5	3.5	100.0
	.	2	.8	MISSING	
		-----	-----	-----	
	TOTAL	258	100.0	100.0	
Mean	2.422	Std Dev	.995	Minimum	1.000
Maximum	5.000				
Valid Cases	256	Missing Cases	2		

Part VI - All Commanders (Cont)

Q61 JR OFF SKILL AND KNOW TO TRAIN

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
STRONGLY AGREE	1	20	7.8	7.8	7.8
AGREE	2	165	64.0	64.2	72.0
NEUTRAL	3	36	14.0	14.0	86.0
DISAGREE	4	31	12.0	12.1	98.1
STRONGLY DISAGREE	5	5	1.9	1.9	100.0
	.	1	.4	MISSING	
	TOTAL	258	100.0	100.0	
Mean	2.362	Std Dev	.865	Minimum	1.000
Maximum	5.000				
Valid Cases	257	Missing Cases	1		

Q62 JR OFF GROUNDED IN UNIT DOCTRINE

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
STRONGLY AGREE	1	6	2.3	2.3	2.3
AGREE	2	121	46.9	47.1	49.4
NEUTRAL	3	54	20.9	21.0	70.4
DISAGREE	4	70	27.1	27.2	97.7
STRONGLY DISAGREE	5	6	2.3	2.3	100.0
	.	1	.4	MISSING	
	TOTAL	258	100.0	100.0	
Mean	2.802	Std Dev	.946	Minimum	1.000
Maximum	5.000				
Valid Cases	257	Missing Cases	1		

Part VI - All Commanders (Cont)

Q63 LEAVENWORTH PCC ADEQUATE

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
STRONGLY AGREE	1	12	4.7	4.8	4.8
AGREE	2	150	58.1	59.5	64.3
NEUTRAL	3	65	25.2	25.8	90.1
DISAGREE	4	18	7.0	7.1	97.2
STRONGLY DISAGREE	5	7	2.7	2.8	100.0
	.	6	2.3	MISSING	
	TOTAL	258	100.0	100.0	
Mean	2.437	Std Dev	.808	Minimum	1.000
Maximum	5.000				
Valid Cases	252	Missing Cases	6		

Q64 BRANCH PCC ADEQUATE

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
STRONGLY AGREE	1	14	5.4	5.6	5.6
AGREE	2	125	48.4	49.8	55.4
NEUTRAL	3	65	25.2	25.9	81.3
DISAGREE	4	34	13.2	13.5	94.8
STRONGLY DISAGREE	5	13	5.0	5.2	100.0
	.	7	2.7	MISSING	
	TOTAL	258	100.0	100.0	
Mean	2.629	Std Dev	.964	Minimum	1.000
Maximum	5.000				
Valid Cases	251	Missing Cases	7		

Part VI - All Commanders (Cont)

Q65 JR SOLDIERS BETTER EDUCATED THAN NCOS

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
STRONGLY AGREE	1	10	3.9	3.9	3.9
AGREE	2	86	33.3	33.6	37.5
NEUTRAL	3	65	25.2	25.4	62.9
DISAGREE	4	92	35.7	35.9	98.8
STRONGLY DISAGREE	5	3	1.2	1.2	100.0
	.	2	.8	MISSING	
		-----	-----	-----	
	TOTAL	258	100.0	100.0	
Mean	2.969	Std Dev	.949	Minimum	1.000
Maximum	5.000				
Valid Cases	256	Missing Cases	2		

Q66 OFF UNDERSTOOD ORG STRUC AND RELTN

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
STRONGLY AGREE	1	14	5.4	5.5	5.5
AGREE	2	186	72.1	72.9	78.4
NEUTRAL	3	27	10.5	10.6	89.0
DISAGREE	4	28	10.9	11.0	100.0
	.	3	1.2	MISSING	
		-----	-----	-----	
	TOTAL	258	100.0	100.0	
Mean	2.271	Std Dev	.727	Minimum	1.000
Maximum	4.000				
Valid Cases	255	Missing Cases	3		

Part VI - All Commanders (Cont)

Q67 POST COMMAND CLIMATE SATISFACTORY

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
STRONGLY AGREE	1	113	43.8	44.3	44.3
AGREE	2	99	38.4	38.8	83.1
NEUTRAL	3	17	6.6	6.7	89.8
DISAGREE	4	19	7.4	7.5	97.3
STRONGLY DISAGREE	5	7	2.7	2.7	100.0
.	.	3	1.2	MISSING	
		-----	-----	-----	
	TOTAL	258	100.0	100.0	
Mean	1.855	Std Dev	1.019	Minimum	1.000
Maximum	5.000				
Valid Cases	255	Missing Cases	3		

Q68 CHAIN OF COMMAND VALUES MATCHED YOURS

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
STRONGLY AGREE	1	80	31.0	31.1	31.1
AGREE	2	132	51.2	51.4	82.5
NEUTRAL	3	20	7.8	7.8	90.3
DISAGREE	4	20	7.8	7.8	98.1
STRONGLY DISAGREE	5	5	1.9	1.9	100.0
.	.	1	.4	MISSING	
		-----	-----	-----	
	TOTAL	258	100.0	100.0	
Mean	1.981	Std Dev	.937	Minimum	1.000
Maximum	5.000				
Valid Cases	257	Missing Cases	1		

Part VI - All Commanders (Cont)

Q69 COC SUPPORTED ACCURATE REPORTING

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
STRONGLY AGREE	1	130	50.4	50.6	50.6
AGREE	2	100	38.8	38.9	89.5
NEUTRAL	3	14	5.4	5.4	94.9
DISAGREE	4	7	2.7	2.7	97.7
STRONGLY DISAGREE	5	5	1.9	1.9	99.6
	6	1	.4	.4	100.0
	.	1	.4	MISSING	
		-----	-----	-----	
	TOTAL	258	100.0	100.0	

Mean 1.677 Std Dev .897 Minimum 1.000  
Maximum 6.000

Valid Cases 257 Missing Cases 1

-----

Q70 ACCURATE ASSESSMENTS AND REPORTS UP

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
STRONGLY AGREE	1	61	23.6	23.7	23.7
AGREE	2	181	70.2	70.4	94.2
NEUTRAL	3	11	4.3	4.3	98.4
DISAGREE	4	4	1.6	1.6	100.0
	.	1	.4	MISSING	
		-----	-----	-----	
	TOTAL	258	100.0	100.0	

Mean 1.837 Std Dev .563 Minimum 1.000  
Maximum 4.000

Valid Cases 257 Missing Cases 1

Part VI - All Commanders (Cont)

Q71 NCO MORAL AND ETHICAL STDS SAT

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
STRONGLY AGREE	1	28	10.9	10.9	10.9
AGREE	2	174	67.4	68.0	78.9
NEUTRAL	3	39	15.1	15.2	94.1
DISAGREE	4	15	5.8	5.9	100.0
	.	2	.8	MISSING	
		-----	-----	-----	
	TOTAL	258	100.0	100.0	
Mean	2.160	Std Dev	.687	Minimum	1.000
Maximum	4.000				
Valid Cases	256	Missing Cases	2		

Q72 OFF MORAL AND ETHICAL STDS SAT

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
STRONGLY AGREE	1	57	22.1	22.2	22.2
AGREE	2	183	70.9	71.2	93.4
NEUTRAL	3	10	3.9	3.9	97.3
DISAGREE	4	6	2.3	2.3	99.6
STRONGLY DISAGREE	5	1	.4	.4	100.0
	.	1	.4	MISSING	
		-----	-----	-----	
	TOTAL	258	100.0	100.0	
Mean	1.875	Std Dev	.612	Minimum	1.000
Maximum	5.000				
Valid Cases	257	Missing Cases	1		

Part VI - All Commanders (Cont)

Q73 DRUG/ALCOHOL PROBLEM FOR JR EM

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
STRONGLY AGREE	1	3	1.2	1.2	1.2
AGREE	2	42	16.3	16.4	17.6
NEUTRAL	3	27	10.5	10.5	28.1
DISAGREE	4	134	51.9	52.3	80.5
STRONGLY DISAGREE	5	50	19.4	19.5	100.0
.	.	2	.8	MISSING	
		-----	-----	-----	
	TOTAL	258	100.0	100.0	
Mean	3.727	Std Dev	.996	Minimum	1.000
Maximum	5.000				
Valid Cases	256	Missing Cases	2		

Q74 DRUG/ALCOHOL PROBLEM FOR NCOS

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
STRONGLY AGREE	1	2	.8	.8	.8
AGREE	2	38	14.7	14.9	15.7
NEUTRAL	3	34	13.2	13.3	29.0
DISAGREE	4	130	50.4	51.0	80.0
STRONGLY DISAGREE	5	51	19.8	20.0	100.0
.	.	3	1.2	MISSING	
		-----	-----	-----	
	TOTAL	258	100.0	100.0	
Mean	3.745	Std Dev	.969	Minimum	1.000
Maximum	5.000				
Valid Cases	255	Missing Cases	3		



Part VI - All Commanders (Cont)

Q75 DRUG/ALCOHOL PROBLEM FOR OFF

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
STRONGLY AGREE	1	1	.4	.4	.4
AGREE	2	6	2.3	2.4	2.7
NEUTRAL	3	14	5.4	5.5	8.2
DISAGREE	4	117	45.3	45.9	54.1
STRONGLY DISAGREE	5	117	45.3	45.9	100.0
.	.	3	1.2	MISSING	
		-----	-----	-----	
	TOTAL	258	100.0	100.0	

Mean 4.345 Std Dev .725 Minimum 1.000  
Maximum 5.000

Valid Cases 255 Missing Cases 3

Q79 UCMJ ACTIONS PER MONTH

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
0-5	1	189	73.3	82.2	82.2
6-10	2	33	12.8	14.3	96.5
11-15	3	6	2.3	2.6	99.1
¶15	4	1	.4	.4	99.6
	5	1	.4	.4	100.0
	.	28	10.9	MISSING	
		-----	-----	-----	
	TOTAL	258	100.0	100.0	

Mean 1.226 Std Dev .554 Minimum 1.000  
Maximum 5.000

Valid Cases 230 Missing Cases 28

Part VI - All Commanders (Cont)

Q81           FREQ MENTORED BY CDR

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
DAILY	1	7	2.7	2.8	2.8
WEEKLY	2	53	20.5	20.9	23.7
MONTHLY	3	53	20.5	20.9	44.7
QUARTERLY	4	47	18.2	18.6	63.2
ANNUALLY	5	20	7.8	7.9	71.1
AT OER TIME	6	33	12.8	13.0	84.2
NEVER	7	40	15.5	15.8	100.0
	.	5	1.9	MISSING	
		-----	-----	-----	
	TOTAL	258	100.0	100.0	
Mean	4.103	Std Dev	1.823	Minimum	1.000
Maximum	7.000				
Valid Cases	253	Missing Cases	5		

Q82           FREQ COUNSELED SUBORDINATES

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
DAILY	1	28	10.9	11.0	11.0
WEEKLY	2	51	19.8	20.0	31.0
MONTHLY	3	81	31.4	31.8	62.7
QUARTERLY	4	87	33.7	34.1	96.9
ANNUALLY	5	5	1.9	2.0	98.8
AT OER TIME	6	3	1.2	1.2	100.0
	.	3	1.2	MISSING	
		-----	-----	-----	
	TOTAL	258	100.0	100.0	
Mean	2.996	Std Dev	1.081	Minimum	1.000
Maximum	6.000				
Valid Cases	255	Missing Cases	3		

Part VI - All Commanders (Cont)

Q83      FREQ POSITIVE WRITTEN COUNSELING

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
DAILY	1	3	1.2	1.2	1.2
WEEKLY	2	6	2.3	2.4	3.5
MONTHLY	3	42	16.3	16.5	20.0
QUARTERLY	4	97	37.6	38.0	58.0
ANNUALLY	5	22	8.5	8.6	66.7
AT OER TIME	6	50	19.4	19.6	86.3
NEVER	7	35	13.6	13.7	100.0
	.	3	1.2	MISSING	
		-----	-----	-----	
	TOTAL	258	100.0	100.0	

Mean            4.643      Std Dev            1.437      Minimum            1.000  
Maximum           7.000

Valid Cases            255      Missing Cases            3

Q84      YOUR FREEDOM TO COMMAND

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
LOW	1	5	1.9	2.0	2.0
MODERATE	2	33	12.8	12.9	14.9
HIGH	3	216	83.7	84.7	99.6
	6	1	.4	.4	100.0
	.	3	1.2	MISSING	
		-----	-----	-----	
	TOTAL	258	100.0	100.0	

Mean            2.843      Std Dev            .468      Minimum            1.000  
Maximum           6.000

Valid Cases            255      Missing Cases            3

Part VI - All Commanders (Cont)

Q85 YOUR SUBORDINATES FREEDOM TO CMD

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
LOW	1	2	.8	.8	.8
MODERATE	2	86	33.3	33.7	34.5
HIGH	3	166	64.3	65.1	99.6
	5	1	.4	.4	100.0
	.	3	1.2	MISSING	
		-----	-----	-----	
	TOTAL	258	100.0	100.0	
Mean	2.655	Std Dev	.516	Minimum	1.000
Maximum	5.000				
Valid Cases	255	Missing Cases	3		

Q86 IMPORTANCE OF STATISTICS

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
NO IMPORTANCE	1	16	6.2	6.3	6.3
NOT ENOUGH	2	5	1.9	2.0	8.2
ABOUT RIGHT	3	174	67.4	68.0	76.2
A LITTLE TOO MUCH	4	46	17.8	18.0	94.1
ENTIRELY TOO MUCH	5	15	5.8	5.9	100.0
	.	2	.8	MISSING	
		-----	-----	-----	
	TOTAL	258	100.0	100.0	
Mean	3.152	Std Dev	.814	Minimum	1.000
Maximum	5.000				
Valid Cases	256	Missing Cases	2		

Part VI - All Commanders (Cont)

Q87 YOUR SENIOR RATER PROFILE KNOWN

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
YES	1	231	89.5	90.2	90.2
NO	2	24	9.3	9.4	99.6
	5	1	.4	.4	100.0
	.	2	.8	MISSING	
		-----	-----	-----	
	TOTAL	258	100.0	100.0	
Mean	1.109	Std Dev	.381	Minimum	1.000
Maximum	5.000				
Valid Cases	256	Missing Cases	2		

Q88 DISCUSS RATINGS WITH SUBORDINATES

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
YES	1	244	94.6	95.3	95.3
NO	2	12	4.7	4.7	100.0
	.	2	.8	MISSING	
		-----	-----	-----	
	TOTAL	258	100.0	100.0	
Mean	1.047	Std Dev	.212	Minimum	1.000
Maximum	2.000				
Valid Cases	256	Missing Cases	2		

Q89 YOUR SENIOR RATER'S PROFILE KNOWN

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
YES	1	104	40.3	41.9	41.9
NO	2	144	55.8	58.1	100.0
	.	10	3.9	MISSING	
		-----	-----	-----	
	TOTAL	258	100.0	100.0	
Mean	1.581	Std Dev	.494	Minimum	1.000
Maximum	2.000				
Valid Cases	248	Missing Cases	10		

Part VI - All Commanders (Cont)

Q90 RATER DISCUSSED YOUR REPORT PRIOR

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
YES	1	171	66.3	69.2	69.2
NO	2	76	29.5	30.8	100.0
	.	11	4.3	MISSING	
		-----	-----	-----	
	TOTAL	258	100.0	100.0	
Mean	1.308	Std Dev	.462	Minimum	1.000
Maximum	2.000				
Valid Cases	247	Missing Cases	11		

Q91 SR RTR DISCUSSED YOUR REPORT PRIOR

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
YES	1	47	18.2	18.9	18.9
NO	2	198	76.7	79.5	98.4
	3	2	.8	.8	99.2
	4	1	.4	.4	99.6
	5	1	.4	.4	100.0
	.	9	3.5	MISSING	
		-----	-----	-----	
	TOTAL	258	100.0	100.0	
Mean	1.839	Std Dev	.473	Minimum	1.000
Maximum	5.000				
Valid Cases	249	Missing Cases	9		

Part VI - All Commanders (Cont)

Q92 SUPPORT FROM HIGHER HEADQUARTERS

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
VERY DISSATISFIED	1	12	4.7	4.7	4.7
DISSATISFIED	2	18	7.0	7.0	11.7
BORDERLINE	3	41	15.9	16.0	27.7
SATISFIED	4	123	47.7	48.0	75.8
VERY SATISFIED	5	62	24.0	24.2	100.0
	.	2	.8	MISSING	
		-----	-----	-----	
	TOTAL	258	100.0	100.0	
Mean	3.801	Std Dev	1.034	Minimum	1.000
Maximum	5.000				
Valid Cases	256	Missing Cases	2		

Q93 HIGHER CDRS KNEW YOUR UNIT STATUS

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
VERY DISSATISFIED	1	11	4.3	4.3	4.3
DISSATISFIED	2	23	8.9	9.0	13.3
BORDERLINE	3	27	10.5	10.5	23.8
SATISFIED	4	121	46.9	47.3	71.1
VERY SATISFIED	5	74	28.7	28.9	100.0
	.	2	.8	MISSING	
		-----	-----	-----	
	TOTAL	258	100.0	100.0	
Mean	3.875	Std Dev	1.063	Minimum	1.000
Maximum	5.000				
Valid Cases	256	Missing Cases	2		

Part VI - All Commanders (Cont)

Q94 FREQ OF IMMEDIATE CDR VISITS

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
NEVER	1	4	1.6	1.6	1.6
WEEKLY	2	76	29.5	29.9	31.5
MONTHLY	3	93	36.0	36.6	68.1
QUARTERLY	4	54	20.9	21.3	89.4
SEMI-ANNUALLY	5	21	8.1	8.3	97.6
ANNUALLY	6	3	1.2	1.2	98.8
LESS THAN ANNUALLY	7	3	1.2	1.2	100.0
	.	4	1.6	MISSING	
	TOTAL	258	100.0	100.0	

Mean 3.130 Std Dev 1.090 Minimum 1.000  
Maximum 7.000

Valid Cases 254 Missing Cases 4

Q95 SENIOR CDRS WOULD SPT IN HARD TIMES

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
STRONGLY AGREE	1	99	38.4	39.0	39.0
AGREE	2	106	41.1	41.7	80.7
NEUTRAL	3	18	7.0	7.1	87.8
DISAGREE	4	18	7.0	7.1	94.9
STRONGLY DISAGREE	5	13	5.0	5.1	100.0
	.	4	1.6	MISSING	
	TOTAL	258	100.0	100.0	

Mean 1.976 Std Dev 1.100 Minimum 1.000  
Maximum 5.000

Valid Cases 254 Missing Cases 4



Part VI - All Commanders (Cont)

Q96 SAT CMD CLIMATE FROM HIGHER HQ

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
STRONGLY AGREE	1	90	34.9	35.2	35.2
AGREE	2	100	38.8	39.1	74.2
NEUTRAL	3	28	10.9	10.9	85.2
DISAGREE	4	24	9.3	9.4	94.5
STRONGLY DISAGREE	5	14	5.4	5.5	100.0
.	.	2	.8	MISSING	
	TOTAL	258	100.0	100.0	
Mean	2.109	Std Dev	1.149	Minimum	1.000
Maximum	5.000				
Valid Cases	256	Missing Cases	2		

Q97 CHAIN OF CMD FAIR TO COMMANDERS

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
YES	1	226	87.6	88.3	88.3
NO	2	25	9.7	9.8	98.0
	4	4	1.6	1.6	99.6
	5	1	.4	.4	100.0
.	.	2	.8	MISSING	
	TOTAL	258	100.0	100.0	
Mean	1.160	Std Dev	.526	Minimum	1.000
Maximum	5.000				
Valid Cases	256	Missing Cases	2		

Part VI - All Commanders (Cont)

Q98 HOW POSITIVE ABOUT ARMY CAREER

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
MUCH MORE POSITIVELY	1	60	23.3	23.5	23.5
MORE POSITIVELY	2	77	29.8	30.2	53.7
ABOUT THE SAME	3	82	31.8	32.2	85.9
LESS POSITIVELY	4	29	11.2	11.4	97.3
MUCH LESS POSITIVELY	5	7	2.7	2.7	100.0
	.	3	1.2	MISSING	
		-----	-----	-----	
	TOTAL	258	100.0	100.0	
Mean	2.396	Std Dev	1.052	Minimum	1.000
Maximum	5.000				
Valid Cases	255	Missing Cases	3		

**Tab C**

## Appendix C Survey

1. What type of battalion did you command?
  1. Combat Arms
  2. Combat Support
  3. Combat Service Support.
  4. Other
2. Your age when you assumed command was:
  1. Under 35
  2. 35-37
  3. 38-40
  4. 41-43
  5. 44-46
3. Your unit was:
  1. Separate
  2. Separate brigade
  3. Divisional
  4. CORPS
  5. Echelons above Corps
  6. Other
4. How long were you in command
  1. under 18 months
  2. 18-23 months
  3. 24-29 months
  4. 30-36 months
  5. More than 36 months
5. What year group are you?
  1. 1966
  2. 1967
  3. 1968
  4. 1969
  5. 1970
  6. 1971
  7. 1972
6. When did you relinquish command?
  1. Before 1988
  2. 1988
  3. 1989
  4. 1990
7. What percentage of your soldiers were women ?
  1. No women in unit
  2. Less than 10%
  3. 10-19%
  4. 20-29%
  5. 30% or Greater

8. What percentage of your officers were women?
  1. No women officers
  2. Less than 10%
  3. 10-19%
  4. 20-29%
  5. 30% or Greater
9. Was your unit coded to preclude the assignment of women to any positions?
  1. Yes
  2. No
  3. Don't know
10. Where did you command?
  1. CONUS
  2. Europe
  3. Korea
  3. Panama
  5. Alaska
  6. Hawaii
  7. Other
11. Was it an accompanied tour?
  1. Yes, my spouse/family accompanied me
  2. Yes, but my spouse/family did not accompany me
  3. No
  4. N/A, I am not married
12. Did you live on post for at least a portion of your command?
  1. Yes
  2. No
13. To what extent did your spouse participate or lead activities to support you while in command?
  1. Almost\never
  2. Seldom
  3. Sometimes
  4. Frequently
  5. Almost always
14. Did your spouse work full or part time while you were in command?
  1. Full time
  2. Part time
  3. Did not work outside the home
15. Did you have direct input in developing your command operating budget (COB)?
  - a. Yes
  - b. Sometimes
  - c. No

16. What portion of your time did budget management require?
  1. 10% or less
  2. 11-20%
  3. 21-30%
  4. 31-40%
  5. 41-50%
  6. More than 50%
17. Was ammunition available for you to meet STRAC standards?
  1. Yes
  2. No
  3. NA
18. Did you have sufficient training funds?
  1. Almost never
  2. Seldom
  3. Sometimes
  4. Frequently
  5. Almost always
19. What was the average personnel turn over rate (per month) during your command
  1. Less than 10%
  2. 10%-15%
  3. 16%-20%
  4. 21%-25%
  5. 26%-30%
  6. More than 30%
20. How often were training resources (i.e. ranges, training areas, etc.) readily available?
  1. Almost never
  2. Seldom
  3. Sometimes
  4. Frequently
  5. Almost always
21. How often were unit unfinanced requirements significant inhibitors to training and operations?
  1. Almost never
  2. Seldom
  3. Sometimes
  4. Frequently
  5. Almost always
22. To what ALO was your unit organized?
  1. 1
  2. 2
  3. 3
  4. N/A

23. Were critical resources necessary to your unit shared with others?

1. Don't know
2. Not at all
3. Slightly
4. Moderately
5. Greatly

24. Did your senior headquarters cross level critical resources between subordinate units?

1. Don't know
2. Not at all
3. Slightly
4. Moderately
5. Greatly

25. Did other units within your major command (division, brigade, or similiar level) hold a higher priority than yours?

- a. Yes
- b. No

26. To what extent did facility availability degrade unit operations and training.

1. Don't know
2. Not at all
3. Slightly
4. Moderately
5. Greatly

27. To what extent did MOS shortages degrade unit effectiveness.

1. Don't know
2. Not at all
3. Slightly
4. Moderately
5. Greatly

28. Your total COB equalled what amount?

1. Less than 1 Million Dollars
2. 1-5 Million Dollars
3. 6-10 Million Dollars
4. Greater than 10 Million Dollars

29. Your assigned Authorized Level of Organization (ALO) constrained your unit's mission readiness.

1. Strongly agree
2. Agree
3. Neutral
4. Disagree
5. Strongly Disagree

30. How frequently did you defer repair parts requisitioning due to lack of funds?
1. Almost never
  2. Seldom
  3. Sometimes
  4. Frequently
  5. Almost always
31. Was your budget based on projected training events or last year's expenditures?
1. Projected training events
  2. Last year's expenditures
  3. Other
32. Sufficient resources were provided to accomplish:
1. All the training I desired
  2. Most of the training I desired
  3. Only required training
  4. Less than required training
  5. Much less than all required training
33. Training was developed IAW the 25 Series of Manuals.
1. Strongly agree
  2. Agree
  3. Neutral
  4. Disagree
  5. Strongly Disagree
34. Senior headquarters provided clear training guidance.
1. Strongly agree
  2. Agree
  3. Neutral
  4. Disagree
  5. Strongly Disagree
35. Training guidance supported the CSA intent for tough realistic training.
1. Strongly Agree
  2. Agree
  3. Neutral
  4. Disagree
  5. Strongly Disagree
36. Repetitious return to the same training areas degraded training.
1. Strongly agree
  2. Agree
  3. Neutral
  4. Disagree
  5. Strongly Disagree



37. How frequently were off post training events an integral part of your training program?

1. Never
2. Seldom
3. Sometimes
4. Frequently
5. Almost always

38. Your unit trained using Mission Training Plans (MTP) developed by TRADOC proponent schools.

1. Strongly agree
2. Agree
3. Neutral
4. Disagree
5. Strongly Disagree

39. MTPs provide the basis for tough realistic training.

1. Strongly Agree
2. Agree
3. Neutral
4. Disagree
5. Strongly Disagree

40. Formulation of training belongs to what group of people?

(Answer on this form, skip to question number 41 on the Scantron sheet)

-----  
-----

41. Higher headquarters taskings, schedule changes etc. hindered your ability to conduct training.

1. Almost never
2. Seldom
3. Sometimes
4. Frequently
5. Almost always

42. Higher headquarters directives enhanced your ability to conduct training.

1. Strongly Agree
2. Agree
3. Neutral
4. Disagree
5. Strongly Disagree

43. To what extent did your training include the combined arms team as well as a dedicated CSS slice?

1. Almost never
2. Seldom
3. Sometimes
4. Frequently
5. Almost always

44. How often did your training include joint service representation?

1. Almost never
2. Seldom
3. Sometimes
4. Frequently
5. Almost always
6. Not applicable

45. The NCO Corps was able to plan and conduct individual training to standard.

1. Strongly Agree
2. Agree
3. Neutral
4. Disagree
5. Strongly Disagree

46. Your unit would have been able to handle an increased individual training requirement if AIT were cut back.

1. Strongly Agree
2. Agree
3. Neutral
4. Disagree
5. Strongly Disagree

47. BNCOC/ANCOC improved the training capability of the NCOs who attended.

1. Strongly Agree
2. Agree
3. Neutral
4. Disagree
5. Strongly Disagree

48. Junior officers were able to plan and conduct small unit collective training.

1. Strongly Agree
2. Agree
3. Neutral
4. Disagree
5. Strongly Disagree

49. The scenarios at the combat training centers supported the Airland battle concept.

1. Strongly Agree
2. Agree
3. Neutral
4. Disagree
5. Strongly Disagree

50. Your unit's performance at the joint training center was reflected on your OER?

1. Yes, explicitly referenced in the report
2. Yes, implied by the quality of the rating
3. No, was not reflected in the rating
4. Don't know

51. How many NTC/CMTC/JRTC rotations did you experience while in command?

1. None
2. 1
3. 2
4. 3
5. 4 or more
6. Not applicable

52. How frequently were quarterly Training Briefs IAW FM 25-100 conducted with your senior rater?

1. Never
2. Annually
3. Semi-Annually
4. Quarterly
5. More frequently than quarterly

53. Did your unit attain standards concerning the frequency of individual marksmanship training?

1. Never
2. Seldom
3. Sometimes
4. Frequently
5. Almost always
6. Not applicable

54. How frequently did you require your units to conduct physical training (per week)?

1. <3 times
2. 3 times
3. 4 times
4. 5 times

55. How long was the normal garrison unit training day?

1. less than 8 hours
2. 8-9hours
3. 10-11 hours
4. 12 hours
5. Greater than 12 hours

56. Did you have an active officer professional development program(OPD)?

1. Yes (Please define its scope and composition on the last page)
2. No

57. Your unit had a sufficient number of training days available to it.

1. Strongly Agree
2. Agree
3. Neutral
4. Disagree
5. Strongly Disagree

58. Newly arrived soldiers had basic mastery of soldier skills.

1. Strongly disagree
2. Disagree
3. Neutral
4. Agree
5. Strongly Agree

59. Newly arrived soldiers were trained to standard in their MOS related skills.

1. Strongly disagree
2. Disagree
3. Neutral
4. Agree
5. Strongly Agree

60. The NCO Corps had sufficient knowledge and ability to carry out its training responsibilities.

1. Strongly disagree
2. Disagree
3. Neutral
4. Agree
5. Strongly Agree

61. The junior officer Corps had sufficient skills and overall professional knowledge to carry out its training responsibilities.

1. Strongly disagree
2. Disagree
3. Neutral
4. Agree
5. Strongly Agree

62. The junior officer Corps was sufficiently grounded in doctrinal unit operations.

1. Strongly disagree
2. Disagree
3. Neutral
4. Agree
5. Strongly Agree

63. The Leavenworth portion of PCC provided an adequate "non-branch peculiar" background prior to your assumption of command. (Please discuss specific strengths or weaknesses on the last page)

1. Strongly disagree
2. Disagree
3. Neutral
4. Agree
5. Strongly Agree

64.. The "branch peculiar" portion of PCC provided an adequate preparation for command. (Please discuss specific strengths or weaknesses on the last page)

1. Strongly disagree
2. Disagree
3. Neutral
4. Agree
5. Strongly Agree

65. Junior enlisted soldiers were on the average better educated than the senior NCOs.

1. Strongly disagree
2. Disagree
3. Neutral
4. Agree
5. Strongly Agree

66. Company grade officers understood organizational structure and relationships.

1. Strongly disagree
2. Disagree
3. Neutral
4. Agree
5. Strongly Agree

67. The command climate on your post was satisfactory.

1. Strongly disagree
2. Disagree
3. Neutral
4. Agree
5. Strongly Agree

68. The chain of command's values matched yours.

1. Strongly disagree
2. Disagree
3. Neutral
4. Agree
5. Strongly Agree

69. The chain of command supported accurate reporting.

1. Strongly disagree
2. Disagree
3. Neutral
4. Agree
5. Strongly Agree

70. You received accurate assessments and reports from your soldiers.

1. Strongly disagree
2. Disagree
3. Neutral
4. Agree
5. Strongly Agree

71. The NCO corps possessed satisfactory moral and ethical standards.

1. Strongly disagree
2. Disagree
3. Neutral
4. Agree
5. Strongly Agree

72. The officer corps possessed satisfactory moral and ethical standards.

1. Strongly disagree
2. Disagree
3. Neutral
4. Agree
5. Strongly Agree

73. Drug/alcohol use among junior enlisted soldiers was a significant problem.

1. Strongly disagree
2. Disagree
3. Neutral
4. Agree
5. Strongly Agree

74. Drug/alcohol use among the NCO corps was a significant problem.

1. Strongly disagree
2. Disagree
3. Neutral
4. Agree
5. Strongly Agree

75. Drug/alcohol use among the officers was a significant problem.

1. Strongly disagree
2. Disagree
3. Neutral
4. Agree
5. Strongly Agree

76. On a scale of 1(low) to 10(high) rate the following groups for competence (Note: Answer questions 76, 77, 78 and 80 on this form and be sure to skip these lines on the Scantron Sheet)::

- a. Other field grade officers
- b. Company grade officers
- c. Warrant Officers
- d. CSMs
- e. MSG/1SGs
- f. SFCs
- g. SSG/SGTs
- h. PVT-SPC

77. Same question for enthusiasm or drive

- a. Other field grade officers
- b. Company grade officers
- c. Warrant Officers
- d. CSMs
- e. MSG/1SGs
- f. SFCs
- g. SSG/SGTs
- h. PVT-SPC

78. For ability to learn?

- a. Other field grade officers
- b. Company grade officers
- c. Warrant Officers
- d. CSMs
- e. MSG/1SGs
- f. SFCs
- g. SSG/SGTs
- h. PVT-SPC

79. How many times per month did you take UCMJ action ?

- 1. 0-5
- 2. 6-10
- 3. 11-15
- 4. More than 15

80. Rank order the following offenses in terms of frequency (1 is least frequent, 7 most frequent):

- a. Drugs
- b. Alcohol
- c. AWOL
- d. Disrespect
- e. Disobedience
- f. Violent crimes
- g. Child/spouse abuse

81. How often did your commander "mentor" you?
1. Daily
  2. Weekly
  3. Monthly
  4. Quarterly
  5. Annually
  6. At OER time
  7. Never
82. How frequently did you counsel subordinates?
1. Daily
  2. Weekly
  3. Monthly
  4. Quarterly
  5. Annually
  6. At OER time
  7. Never
83. How often did you conduct positive counseling in writing?
1. Daily
  2. Weekly
  3. Monthly
  4. Quarterly
  5. Annually
  6. At OER time
  7. Never
84. Rate your freedom to command.
1. Low
  2. Moderate
  3. High
85. Rate your junior commanders' freedom to command under you:
1. Low
  2. Moderate
  3. High
86. How important were statistics in your command?
1. Of no importance
  2. Not important enough
  3. About right
  4. A little too important
  5. Entirely too important
87. Did your subordinates know your senior rater profile?
1. Yes
  2. No
88. Did you discuss your ratings with subordinates prior to forwarding their OER?
1. Yes
  2. No



89. Did you know your senior rater's profile?
1. Yes
  2. No
90. Did your rater discuss your rating before forwarding your report?
1. Yes
  2. No
91. Did your senior rater discuss your senior rating before forwarding your report?
1. Yes
  2. No
92. Were you satisfied with the support you received from your higher headquarters?
1. Very dissatisfied
  2. Dissatisfied
  3. Borderline
  4. Satisfied
  5. Very satisfied
93. Were you satisfied that the commanders above you knew how your unit was performing?
1. Very dissatisfied
  2. Dissatisfied
  3. Borderline
  4. Satisfied
  5. Very satisfied
94. How frequently did your immediate commander visit?
1. Never
  2. Weekly
  3. Monthly
  4. Quarterly
  5. Semi-annually
  6. Annually
  7. Less than once per year
95. Your senior commanders would support you in difficult times?
1. Strongly disagree
  2. Disagree
  3. Neutral
  4. Agree
  5. Strongly Agree
96. Your higher headquarters established a satisfactory command climate.
1. Strongly disagree
  2. Disagree
  3. Neutral
  4. Agree
  5. Strongly Agree

97. Did you feel the chain of command was fair to you and/or other commanders.

1. Yes
2. No.

98. Do you feel as positive about an Army career now as you did when you first decided to make it a career?

1. Much more positively
2. More positively
3. About the same
4. Less positively
5. Much less positively

Please use the remainder of the survey to answer questions requiring written responses, amplify any of your short responses, or to address any area relating to the validity of the Army imperatives at Battalion level. Thank you for your time and effort.

**Tab D**

## Appendix D. Anecdotal Comments

1. Sixty nine of the 256 respondents to the survey elected to add a total of 91 handwritten comments to their input although these comments were not required. Forty seven of the comments addressed command climate, twenty four addressed training, ten the quality of subordinate leaders, seven the availability and management of resources, and only three the quality of the soldiers in the force. Perhaps the most significant group of comments concern the relationship between the surveyed officer and his or her immediate supervisors (rater and senior rater). These comments are in the Command Climate group found in paragraph 6 below. These comments have been extracted and are reproduced below. The comments are as close to verbatim as possible while still maintaining the confidentiality of the officer making the comment. The comments are separated by category with the sequence of categories corresponding to the sequence in the paper. Each comment or set of comments by an individual are separated by a short horizontal line at the left margin. Names and for the most part duty positions have been replaced with grades in brackets.

2. A total of twenty four comments were made concerning battalion level training. The most common comment concerns having more training requirements than assets in both aviation

and CSS units. The comments follow:

We never went to NTC as battalion; only sent a slice of aviation. My activity was mostly to insure proper integrated training during trainup phase with the supported division, working mostly with the DISCOM.

---

The long pole in the tent for individual mission qualification training (ATK Helicopter unit) is instructor pilots. This especially hurts night (NVG) mission training. One instructor pilot per attack helicopter company is insufficient to handle all the aircrew training tasks. We are not only overburdening the aviators, but also placing them at risk.

The problem is that we are not structured with mechanics, instructor pilots and just plain pilots to support our OPTEMPO. In peacetime this means that our soldiers work nights and weekends, not only to maintain the OPTEMPO, but to meet equipment readiness standards that the Army maintenance and supply systems do not support. For example, AVSCOM provides a maintenance structure and parts resupply system that will achieve at least 70% for Attack Helicopters yet USR standards to achieve C-1 is 75% and to meet the OPTEMPO I needed to maintain at least 80 to 85%. This translated into me overworking my people to make up for systemic problems.

---

Imperatives - Platitudes, gimmicks. From the minds of simpletons. 25-100 prediction. Once (CSA) retires, this

publication will assume its rightful position - file 13.

---

MTP's not fully developed or published during my tenure.

---

MTP's did not exist for MSB's/FSB's. We used old "pure" ARTEP manuals.

---

The majority of the Army is RC. This survey is tilted towards evaluation of AC. The most important part of the Army is CSS. This survey gets its rocks off on NTC; how about LOGEX, WINTEX, etc..

CSA does not support RC training.

TRADOC does not plan PCC training for RC.

---

CMTC (Hohenfels) has significant limitations due to size - Deep battle has little meaning.

---

We did FM 25-100 "by the book".

---

Korea may be the best training environment other than NTC/JRTC/BCTP.

Job books were very important in the battalion.

---

Key to combined arms and slice training is the use of MILES. Use it and the other arms want to participate.

---

We trained out of garrison 100 days per year at USAREUR and

allied training areas. Money was not an object.

---

Neither PCC phase addressed training distractors in CSS units. A multifunctional maintenance battalion at EAC provides support on an area basis - it is extremely hard to orchestrate combined arms training short of a major exercise. CINC guidance was 5 hours of uninterrupted "SGT's time" per week. Difficult to organize realistic challenging training on a weekly basis while maintaining DA performance standards for supply and maintenance support. A 3 to 5 day exercise once a month or every 6 weeks proved much more effective. Soldiers were very proficient in their PMOS based on their day to day performance. FTXs provided the opportunity to develop/improve soldier tactical skills and challenged junior officers to plan training requirements. Other training distractors were area UCMJ jurisdiction for 17 units, installation coordinator for 3 installations, 650 local nationals with a works council and approximately 350 non-divisional customers.

---

Training management is broken in most parts of the Army. The CTC hammer is the only way to fix it. Reason - without CTC's training does not have enough priority and most officers do not know how to do it. To do it properly, you must first be tactically proficient and second totally believe in developing subordinates. Next you must assume you will go to war during your command. For most, the CTCs provide that threat and a rote script to follow which is about an 80% solution. A good question

to ask is, In your battalion what was the technique for marking FFL for friendly air. Most commanders do not have the answer because they haven't been in combat at CTC nor have they sat down and really gone over war tasks and trained on them.

---

There were no MTPs for my type unit.

---

In my experience the biggest limiting factor or obstacle to good training was lack of imagination and initiative on the part of a commander. I never claimed that lack of any training resource, except .50 cal ammo when we first got 50's, caused poor training.

---

We had adequate training days to train our TOE company - not adequate for the TDA company. Was my priority as both could not train and do daily missions.

---

CTC experience was not as positive as it could have been. CTC's fail to teach soldiers how to win. They are too restrictive.

---

TRADOC based SQTs are not based upon METL tasks for MOS peculiar skills. Thus training time for SQT was required in addition to all METL training. Ideal solution would be a system that allowed mutually supporting training. Soldiers should not be SQT tested on a technical level for items not found in their units.

---

Training guidance was invariably late from both Corps and COSCOM, in some cases not being received until 7 to 8 months into the



training year. That of Corps was totally focused on Combat Arms requirements with little or no consideration of CSS requirements. In scheduling constrained training resources in USAREUR, CSS units were repeatedly bumped from training sites and ranges in favor of combat units. Additionally when range scheduling conferences were conducted at the MILCOM, non-div units were always scheduled last and around divisional units, with division combat arms having priority. That is acceptable, in fact necessary however CSS/non-div units frequently were physically unable to complete basic (mandatory) training requirements yet were not relieved of the requirements or afforded any additional support.

QTBs were frequently 3 to 4 months late and constantly unscheduled. In essence, QTBs were conducted semiannually.

---

The Army is (has been) confronted with a serious dilemma. New technology is placing serious burdens on our maintenance personnel. Should they be soldiers first? or high tech repairmen? There is not enough time to satisfy both needs and train to standard.

CSS units must be allowed to train (not just expose) their personnel to their technical skills. It takes much longer to train up an electrician or sheet metal or engine repairman than it does to train a soldier to shoot to a marksmen or sharpshooter standard - or any other basic soldier skill. Logistics soldiers must have basic competency skills for survival on the battlefield - but they need not be at the same level of performance as that

of an infantryman in a light or mech unit.

The Army has a significant training problem in peacetime. The training publications do not address standards of performance for CSS. For that matter no TRADOC school that I found trains to time standards of performance - changes an engine in 1 hour or less with no deficiencies, or something like that.

---

Never went to CTC. Division Cav not allowed to play in that sandbox or practise METL in the arer

---

I believe there is a major problem with qualification ammo in CSS units. Unlike other units, M60 MGs are not really assigned to an individual or individual crew, nor should they be. Everyone has an MOS mission and selected individuals cannot be continuously responsible for this weapon system which is critical to defense. Additional individuals must be qualified to insure perimeter (minimal) coverage on a 24 hour basis. Same applies to vehicle mounted MG - a particular driver or crew may not always be assigned to the same truck when 24 hour continuous operations are mission essential.

Garrison mission support is training by my definition.

---

I became frustrated with the METL as a yardstick. It became the focus of attention instead of training. MTPs are good for planning, administering training events, but once they are selected, they should not be used to flesh out METLs. METLs are designed to recognize that we cant do everything - so do what is

important (resource too). When I got to my unit the METL was 27 task force missions long! Give me a break. By the time I got to input to my quarterly training calendar almost 90% of the days had something in them from higher headquarters or were constrained by MTA which you had to be trained up for before you got there. We haven't broken the code yet. I personally believe that the J-series line company can only do one thing right a day in the training arena - looking for more takes leaders and soldiers away from training.

---

3. Seven comments were made concerning resources and the effort required to manage them. Most address ammunition however one makes a strong statement about child care.

At my post battalions are there to train to fight; O-6s worry about dollars. My input was to fight for events and non-dollar resources, the dollars would follow.

---

For the most part there was sufficient training ammunition, however 2.75 inch aerial rockets were always a problem. At different times I couldn't get the types or quantity I needed. STRAC allocations do not provide sufficient quantities for an Attack Helicopter Crew to become proficient with rockets. Our simulator (AH-1) does not adequately replicate aerial rocketry tasks. The only way for a crew to become proficient is to fire frequently (at least quarterly), neither the STRAC ammo

allocation, the USAREUR ammo supply system nor range time allocations could support this. As for types, most of the time we received training rockets without the marking fuze, as a result pilots received no feedback from the round's impact. Training quality is almost nil when firing these type rockets.

---

I spent less than 10% of my time on resource management during the first half of the fiscal year and 10 or more percent during the second half.

I received enough ammo for major systems but not enough for small arms.

---

Resources were adequate except in one critical area, child care. In CONUS soldiers have plenty of commercial options. In Europe they suffered; their children suffered; the mission was affected. Child care is a provision the Army must make in order to live up to all the BS about "caring for soldiers and families".

---

My XO spent 20% of his time on budget.

---

Toward the end of my tour as dollars began to be reduced I reduced repair parts requisitioning (Oct 89 - Feb 90).

---

Authorized ALO is not a resource constraint. The constraint is the total strength authorization under the Army of Excellence, which basically gutted CS&CSS units.

---

4. Leaders were the subject of ten comments. Several of the comments addressed the tendency of warrant officers and command sergeants major to be either very good or very bad. The comments follow:

The NCO Corps is slowly getting into training management. NCOs in aviation units are somewhat behind, but the key to bringing them along is the CSM. We (AV Branch) have got to set the highest standards for senior NCOs and CSMs. Only the best should make it.

New WO-1 and LT attack helicopter pilots had little aerial gunnery skills and very weak knowledge of Attack Helicopter Company collective tasks. We train pilots but not aviators nor platoon leaders.

---

Branch OBC focused on generic combined arms doctrine and LT skills in expected duty positions. It did not include a significant amount of unit specific tactics and doctrine.

---

All 1SGs were able to handle appropriate training management tasks. Only 50-60% of the platoon sergeants could and very few squad leaders. Those that could handle these tasks were young. In rating CSMs on a scale of 1 to 10, I had one 10 and one zero.

---

Many NCOs self destruct in Korea (morally and ethically). In Korea booze is a big problem in the NCO force.

---

On a scale of 1 to 10, I had two CSMs a 1 (low) and a 7.

---

On a scale of 1 to 10, 1SGs rated 8 for enthusiasm, MSGs not in 1SG positions rated a 3.

---

NCOs in my Special Forces Battalion were very high quality (e.g. minimum GT was 110).

---

Could not have asked for better officers and NCOs in my first command (CS BN in Europe). In recruiting battalion the NCOs were extremely well prepared and the mission was well resourced. Need to keep supporting USAREC BNs with quality leadership and NCOs because of the potential for integrity problems and because of the high payoff in bringing in quality soldiers.

---

On a scale of 1 to 10 warrant officers were either 10s or 1s, no inbetween. I had three 10s and two 1s.

---

On a scale of 1 to 10, I had 2 CSMs that were 1s and one 10.

---

5. Three responses addressed the quality of the junior soldiers in the Army. The comments follow:

The environment in Korea presented primarily/predominantly alcohol related problems with junior enlisted, NCO and junior

officers. Actually this was my biggest behavioral problem.  
Drugs were insignificant.

---

In Korea booze is a big problem in the junior enlisted force.

---

Quality of soldiers was absolutely superb. I could not have  
asked for better young soldiers.

---

6. Of the forty seven comments that addressed command climate,  
thirty eight dealt with the relationship between the surveyed  
officer and his or her superiors. A majority contain a negative  
comment about at least one rater or senior rater of the four that  
most respondents served under. The comments follow:

Chain of command was fair to commanders except that attack  
officers probably had a slight edge over lift officers - I had to  
fight for parity.

---

I've kept my part of the contract, but the Army is always  
changing the rules & benefits - we lost.

---

Senior rater was a despicable \_\_\_\_ head!

---

My (O-8) went over both my OERs with me. This is the first time  
in 20 years.

---

I had 2 (O-6's) and 2 (O-8's). All except one of the (O-6's) were outstanding in every respect.

---

Senior rater's profile known only by reviewing microfiche, (O-8) did not publish it. (O-6) knew how unit was performing (O-8) did not. (O-6) training guidance outstanding, (O-8) guidance was lousy.

---

Did not know senior rater profile until processed by MILPERCEN.

---

I had two different raters during my command tour and they were exact opposites as far as involvement in my business and support with higher headquarters.

---

The command climate in the Brigade was satisfactory, the community commander was a "0". I was very positive about my career after first command, however two years in ROTC land since then dimmed my enthusiasm.

---

My rater (O-6) and senior rater (O-8's) were both located 3 hours by road away. Both my (O-6s) were excellent. They knew me, the battalion and all of the officers. They were supportive, open and established excellent command climates. The 2 (O-8's) knew nothing about me or the battalion. One visited once at our invitation after cancelling three times. The other would not



have recognized me. Neither ever talked to me about standards, expectations, problems, etc. I simply got my OER in the mail.

---

My senior rater NEVER physically visited the battalion in garrison or in the field despite several invitations from me and my (O-6). He finally attended a dining-in with only the officers and CSM. I had to visit my rater more than he visited me.

---

Climate changed with change of (O-6). Good at first, then bad. Immediate commander only visited unit in the field. First senior commander would have supported me the second one wouldn't.

---

My (O-6) was as fine an officer as I have ever served under, as was my second (O-8). The first neither counseled or gave feedback to battalion level commanders. My intermediate rater was an (O-7) whom I had little or no contact with and although he was positive in his evaluations, he had no business in evaluating me. Despite these shortcomings, I found the command climate to be positive and non-threatening.

---

Had a (O-8) change of command that included new (O-7's) and (O-6) in headquarters (old (O-6) fired by new (O-8)) - old (O-7's) and old (O-8) promoted. New (O-8) absolutely crushed the spirit of the command. He also changed training calendar and dollar allocations constantly - planning was nonexistent. Orders were given but not disseminated - often found out about order when I was told I was disobeying it. Some issues were ignored others

were micromanaged.

---

(O-7) HQ also served a (O-8) and was a bureaucratic place anyway. We were fortunate to have (O-7) as the commander. We lived under a microscope in a fish bowl where any misconduct was magnified.

---

Command climate improved 2nd year over 1st year after (O-6) change of command.

---

Command climate comments:

- too much interference in details by higher hq
  - no priorities; everything was number one
  - everyone (cdrs and staff) got burned out (except soldiers)
  - did lots of things OK/well, but didn't do important things as well as we should have.
- 

First (O-6) CDR understood 25-100 and pushed it. Second ignored it, made fun of it and didn't use it.

---

I worked for 2 (O-8's) and 2 (O-6s). Both (O-6's) discouraged bad news by their actions. The two (O-8's) were like night and day. One was laid back, encouraged independence but not an overwhelming drive to maximize every opportunity. The other was a detailed micromanager that squeezed the last drop of blood out of every opportunity and out of every person. Both were

effective, however I don't think the organization could stand a long period of time with the second without burning out.

---

Battle focused training as I viewed it for my organization was hindered by higher HQ "mandatory" training directed in "shotgun" blast form -- all units do x amount of y training regardless of local commander's evaluation. Higher HQ directives were often violated by higher headquarters itself (locked in training time).

---

I served under two (O-6s) during the period. The answers here reflect the more favorable relationship. Each was my rater during one period of time. The senior rater remained the same. Were I to answer based on the lesser of the two the ratings would indicate a self serving, biased, vindictive senior commander oriented only to self aggrandizement with no concern for soldiers. If he hasn't been SERB'ed he should be.

---

I saw training and caring for soldiers as the most important imperatives. Unfortunately, the (O-8) headquarters gave lip service to training.

---

I moved my battalion from one post to another. There was an amazing difference in the two posts. On the first the (O-6) let me command and the post provided less support for the troop units. On the second, the (O-6) commanded everything - visited twice a day. The post was much more oriented to training and

commanders. The (O-9 headquarters) provided a great environment at the 2nd post.

---

One commander never visited the battalion. The second commander was tactically and technically proficient.

---

Had two (O-8) commanders. The first never "mentored" me, gave me low freedom to command, gave my subordinates low freedom to command, would not support me in difficult times and did not establish a satisfactory command climate. The second was a total opposite. The Army is the Army, and people are people - you must expect change; certainly you must expect good and poor climates but concentrate on doing your best.

---

Experienced total change of command (senior level) half way through my command. First group provided outstanding command climate - open communications, frequent feedback, good place to command. Last group was the pits - extremely defensive, little (or one way) commo, more interested in show than go - not a good place to command. The 2nd senior rater (the next commander in chain) visited only for QTBs, otherwise he never came to my command or visited training. The second chain of command was "fairer" to some commanders than others.

---

OER System - Double standard. (O-6) and below commanders played the game - support form, midcourse counseling, final OER counseling. Above this level - the domain of generals - the

system breaks down and is nonexistent. As an example, in a one year period at (CONUS post) I saw my senior rater (O-8) one time for 15 minutes - disgusting. Yet he controls my future. I hope he suffers from incurable insomnia.

Mentoring - Bankrupt in the field - spotty execution. A program on its \_\_\_\_.

---

My commander was 2600 miles away and fighting for his political survival. I was pretty much on my own; but knew I could get his help in a pinch. (Positive about Army career) I used to know my future with a sense of certainty. I have no idea what the future now holds.

---

I experienced a complete breakdown in adequate, timely counselling from my superiors. My senior rater (O-8) had an atrocious profile (all in the top block except very few in 2nd block) and this was well known in PERSCOM, but no action was taken to counsel him on getting with the program. He is now (4 star). The Army's emphasis on performance counselling is totally hypocritical when senior officers can ignore their responsibilities.

---

I commanded a light battalion in a LID. Division did not understand doctrine nor had started METL development. 1 (O-7) was high profile, low tactical ability guy with no human qualities worth mentioning. He was a tremendous inhibitor. Division became great based on (O-8) and battalion commanders.

These surveys fail to isolate the folks that care about their units over themselves. Political O-5s still rise to the top too easily. Fortunately it was my experience that enough O-5s truly care about what's really important and do the right things. The ADC-M/O is key evaluator - O-6s in my experience were not equipped (most too worried about remote possibility they might make O-7). First ADC-O was shallow and had no interpersonal skills, the change was critical to infuse proper orientation on training. Our Army is the best ever. Hopefully something here will help it get even better.

---

(O-6) commanders were supportive and helpful. (O-8) commander lost sight of his own goals and values. Slipped into a command by statistic routine we did not have for the first 1 1/2 years. Command climate went steadily downhill during his tenure. Most was buffered by (O-6) and battalion commanders but it was still pretty bad at his level.

---

Would like to add I thought training in the (O-8 command) was the best I've seen in 22 years. Primarily due to (O-8) more than my (O-6).

---

Probably my greatest disappointment in command came from my senior officers - rater and senior rater. My rater never counselled me nor told me what he expected. The only time I saw him or heard from him was when "we" had a problem. It was a joke in my outer office that, "uh-oh, we must have \_\_\_\_\_ up - the

colonel is on the line". I received my OERs completed, signed and delivered to me through distribution! So did other battalion commanders in the unit. I never saw my senior rater except at huge (O-9 command) social functions twice a year.

---

The way my superiors treated me as a battalion commander was completely foreign to my career long expectation. I think my commander felt threatened by me. Rarely, if ever, was I supported in a position conflicting with that of higher staff.

---

For the first 18 months my commander mentored me often. The commander during my last 6 months never mentored me or any other commander. It is my opinion that he was incapable. I knew the first senior raters profile, not the second. The first commander established satisfactory command climate, the second did not. First commander was fair to me, second was not. The Army made a mistake in selecting my second commander, his accent and humor made for interesting listening but he didn't know the difference between tactics and grapefruit. He provided no counseling or leadership.

---

Best job I ever had.

---

I was counseled when needed or as appropriate informally. Both (O-6)'s were good to great in this area. I knew senior rater's

profile at start of period but not when I was given OER. Not a problem.

---

My (O-8) was a superb trainer who understood the Army training system and made it work. Finest mentor I have had with respect to training and maximizing training resources.

---

OER counselling - No officer efficiency report ever left my headquarters until the officer was counselled by me personally (as rater or senior rater). Same for NCOER's if I was the rater or Senior Rater. I did not counsel if I was the reviewer on an NCOER, the rest of the rating chain did.

---

I rated or senior rater over 55 officers and therefore placed heavy emphasis on how I conducted counselling, evaluated performance standards and maintained an accurate senior rater profile. Every officer knew where he stood months prior to the OER; I realized right away, with such a large officer population, that one of my most critical tasks that would impact on the entire unit was how I managed the OER program. One of the reasons we had good morale was because of the fair, honest upfront approach to counselling. It was tough, but it worked.

---

Drug cases were the significant majority of those I handled because all drug cases were handled at the field grade level.



But, I did not find that I experienced a significant level of drug problems.

---

Too many moves (broken furniture, dollars lost, slow claims process, new schools/friends) - has caused severe strain on the family which when coupled with the intensity of job requirements makes life tough for the wife and children.

---

My mission was 24 hours per day, 7 days a week. Training was conducted at all times. Normal day for soldier was 10 to 11 hours per day, 5 days per week.

---

Did not have to give many Article 15's. I reserved jurisdiction on drug cases. Almost all others handled by company commanders.

---

I commanded a good unit with outstanding young soldiers, terrific CSM and 1SG's, good young officers and an excellent command environment. We executed all basic Army programs essentially by the book. Deployed my (MTOE) unit twice. In general had a great time.

---

I counselled my subordinates frequently if needed - informally. I think constant mentoring and advise giving is part of leadership responsibilities so long as they have room to grow and stay within parameters.

---

Initial counselling occurred with the -1 and then I counselled every officer/NCO that I senior rated. Persons who were going to get a negative rating were counselled between the -1 and the final rating.

---